

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

---

5-1999

## Fathers and Sons: An Examination of Distancing Patterns During Adolescence

Mark Ogletree

*Utah State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Ogletree, Mark, "Fathers and Sons: An Examination of Distancing Patterns During Adolescence" (1999). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 2652.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/2652>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).



Dr. Jones

FATHERS AND SONS: AN EXAMINATION OF DISTANCING PATTERNS  
DURING ADOLESCENCE

by

Mark D. Ogletree

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Family and Human Development

Approved:

---

Randall M. Jones  
Major Professor

---

Jay D. Schvaneveldt  
Committee Member

---

Scot M. Allgood  
Committee Member

---

Kathy Piercy  
Committee Member

---

E. Helen Berry  
Committee Member

---

Noelle Crockett  
Interim Dean of Graduate  
Studies

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY  
Logan, Utah

1999

Copyright © Mark D. Ogletree 1999  
All Rights Reserved

## ABSTRACT

Fathers and Sons: A Examination of Distancing Patterns During Adolescence

by

Mark D. Ogletree, Doctor of Philosophy

Utah State University, 1999

Major Professor:     Randall M. Jones  
Department:   Family and Human Development

Although there has been a new wave of research on fathering, little has focused specifically on the father and son relationship during adolescence. Previous research has documented that fathers and their daughters tend to distance themselves and disengage at the onset of menarche; however, the study and analysis of what happens to fathers and sons during the onset of puberty has been practically neglected. Several studies through the mid 80s and early 90s documented that parents and children tend to separate during adolescence, but only scant research has been conducted since that time. The goal of this study was to advance the knowledge base of father and son relationships during adolescence by examining the associations between pubertal status and psychosocial status, pubertal status and father involvement and psychosocial status and father involvement. Erikson's theory of psychosocial development was well-suited to guide this research because of his emphasis on development through the life-span. Particularly, Erikson's postulates regarding identity, adolescence and mid life were helpful in driving the research methodology and explaining the findings.

First, the *Peterson Development Scale* was used to assess pubertal status from

both a father and son viewpoint. The measure was also useful in categorizing the young men studied into three pubertal groups. Second, the *Parental Support Inventory* was used to measure father-son involvement from the perspective of both fathers and their sons. Third, to measure the son's psychosocial status, the *Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status* was employed, and to measure the father's psychosocial status, the *Identity Status Inventory* was utilized.

Findings suggest that pubertal status does impact psychosocial development. In fact, there were statistically significant differences reported by fathers and sons between the three pubertal groups (pre, trans, and post) on the psychosocial status scale of foreclosure. The young men in the study scored high on the foreclosed scale in pre-puberty and low in post-puberty. Typically, young men who score high on the foreclosure scale adopt the values and beliefs of their parents and rarely engage in questioning. Hence, as young men move through pubertal development, they begin to separate from the ideologies of their parents and seek out their own beliefs and opinions. Another finding suggested that as young men move through puberty, involvement with their father decreases, particularly on the dimensions of physical affection and general support. This study also demonstrated that fathers and sons do not perceive involvement or satisfaction in the same way. In fact, what fathers and sons need from each other appears to be different. Another significant finding was that fathers who score high on the information orientation scale (thoroughly consider relevant information before decisions and commitments are made) and the normative information scale (primarily concerned with the

expectations of others) were less likely to have a son who scored high on the diffusion scale (low commitment, low exploration, live for the moment, impulsive). Finally, fathers who score high on the diffuse scale (procrastinating or failing to resolve conflicts) are less involved with their sons when compared to fathers who score high on the information or normative scales. In fact, fathers who score high on the information orientation and sons who score high on the foreclosed orientation are more involved with each other than any other psychosocial group.

(128 pages)

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Without the help of many people, this dissertation and subsequent degree would have never come to fruition. I owe much to my family, close friends, and colleagues at Utah State University.

First, I want to thank my wife of 14 years, Janie. She has rarely complained and been totally supportive of this endeavor. Sometimes she has had to literally pull me by my ears right into her face and remind me what I am studying - marriage and family relationships. I have found much irony in seeking this degree and writing this project. Here at the University, I have been studying marriage and family relationships, and in particular, fatherhood; yet, many times I have felt like I have neglected my marriage and fathering duties in order to "make the grade." Through it all, Janie has been the one who has held our family together in every way. She has chauffeured multiple car pools, helped with most of the children's homework and projects, painted and puttied the walls, borne our 7th child, and even broke her arm in the process of it all. She is a trooper, and I love her. Always, she has believed in me and assured me that I could make it through this journey. I would also like to express my love and gratitude to my seven children: Brittany, Brandon, Bethany, McKenzie, Madison, Cassidy, and Callie. They have been patient and have been willing to make sacrifices while their Dad has been working on his dissertation. I love them and dedicate this work specifically to my only son, Brandon. Brandon, I hope and pray that I can be the type of father you deserve. I look forward, once again, to our all day basketball tournaments on the driveway.

Secondly, I would like to thank Dr. Randy Jones. He has been nothing less than inspiring and motivational. On the days I really didn't want to go on, nor thought I could, he always gave me hope, and always assured me that I was equal to the task. Randy went many hours above and beyond the call of duty. I especially thank him for the summer of 1999. Although he was not on contract, he was available whenever I needed him. I am thankful for his professionalism, his academic advisement and mainly his friendship.

I would also like to thank my colleagues in the "Swamp": Ken Call, Jeff Chapman, Sterling Knapp, Ray Kelly, Wayne Hunsaker, Jim Hendrix, David Hirschi, and honorary "Swamp" members, Bruce Rogharr, and Dee Barrett. Without their constant checking in, their encouraging words, and their expressions of confidence in me, I would have been lost. They made my job at the Logan Institute my own therapy for coping with all the demands of a dissertation.

Also, thanks to my colleagues in the doctoral program: Kreg Edgmon, Diana Coyl, Cheryl Cheek, Kevin Galbraith, and Bruce Monson. This was my cohort, my "doctoral group." With us, there was no competition; however, there was a high degree of concern and care. I have never known a group of Ph.D. students like our group. Instead of a cut-throat atmosphere, there was a climate of assistance, helpfulness and goodness. Each person wanted the other to succeed. No one wanted to leave the other behind, and no one did. I will always remember these graduate colleagues of mine for their demonstration of the true spirit of professionalism and academic integrity.

Mark D. Ogletree



## CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	vi
LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
CHAPTER	
I.    INTRODUCTION .....	1
Problem .....	4
Research Objectives .....	6
II.   LITERATURE REVIEW .....	10
Developmental Outcomes of Father/Son Involvement .....	10
Beyond Father Presence: Father and Son Involvement.....	13
Erikson and Conceptual Framework .....	22
Father and Son Identity .....	34
Summary .....	36
III.  METHODS .....	39
Subjects .....	39
Design .....	43
Ethical Considerations .....	46
Measurement .....	46
Data Collection Procedures .....	57
Data Reduction and Transformation .....	58
IV.  RESULTS .....	59
Reliability and Validity .....	59
Hypotheses Testing .....	70
Hypothesis 1.....	70
Hypothesis 2.....	73
Hypothesis 3.....	80
Hypothesis 4.....	82
Summary.....	90

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS .....	92
Methodological Review .....	92
Summary of Findings .....	93
Limitations .....	112
Recommendations .....	115
REFERENCES .....	120
APPENDICES .....	132
Appendix A (Informed Consent).....	133
Appendix B (Sons' Version of the Survey).....	136
Appendix C (Fathers' Version of the Survey).....	147
Appendix D (Source Table for Psychosocial Status -Sons)..	155
Appendix E (Source Table for Psychosocial Status -Fathers)	157
Appendix F (Source Table for Pubertal Status -FR).....	159
Appendix G (Source Table for Pubertal Status - SR).....	161
Appendix H (Vita).....	163

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Response Rates of Each Location Surveyed.....	41
2	Discriminant/Convergent Validity: Father and Son Pubertal Status Intercorrelations .....	60
3	PSI Subscale Reliabilities - Cronbach's Alpha: Fathers and Sons .....	63
4	Discriminant/Convergent Validity: PSI Subscale Intercorrelations between Fathers and Sons .....	64
5	EOM-EIS Subscale Reliabilities: Cronbach's Alpha .....	66
6	EOM-EIS Discriminant/Convergent Validity: Status Intercorrelations .....	67
7	ISI Discriminant/Convergent Validity: Identity Status Intercorrelations for Fathers .....	69
8	Puberty Status by Mean Scores for Psychosocial Status .....	71
9	Pubertal Status (Fathers' Ratings) by Mean scores for Father Involvement (Fathers' Ratings) .....	74
10	Pubertal Status (Sons' Ratings) by Mean scores for Father Involvement (Sons' Ratings) .....	76
11	Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Father Involvement: Differences between Father and Son Mean Score Responses .....	78
12	Correlations between Pubertal Status and PSI Subscales: Fathers' Ratings by Sons' Ratings .....	79
13	Correlations between Father Psychosocial Status and Son Psychosocial Status .....	81

14	Correlations of Fathers' Psychosocial Status with Fathers' Ratings of Involvement .....	83
15	Correlations of Sons' Psychosocial Status with Sons' Ratings of Father Involvement .....	85
16	Correlations of Sons' Psychosocial Status with Fathers' Ratings of Own Involvement .....	87
17	Correlations of Fathers' Psychosocial Status with Sons' Ratings of Father Involvement .....	89
18	Correlations between Time per day, Time per week, and Father Involvement .....	111

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

*"When I was a teenager I thought  
my father was ignorant. When I was  
twenty I was amazed at what the old  
man had learned in a few years"*

*-Mark Twain*

In a *Time/CNN* poll, 53% of the people interviewed reported that our country is in "deep and serious trouble" (Hull, 1995). One of the reasons as to "why" our country is in such trouble may be due to another "Black Plague": not AIDS, but *Fatherlessness*. For example, the cover story of the 4 May 1998 edition of *Sports Illustrated* was entitled "Where's Daddy?" The article documented numerous professional athletes who have fathered alarming numbers of illegitimate children - one NBA Star has fathered seven children by six different women. For the most part, these men rarely visit their children, nor do they have plans of establishing a meaningful association with them. They simply write a check for \$8,000 a month and send it to a child that they will never develop a relationship with, fathering by mail so to speak (Wahl & Wertheim, 1998). This propensity, however, is not a phenomenon in which only professional athletes and celebrities engage. Unfortunately, the "Missing Father Movement" is much more widespread (Blankenhorn, 1995). For instance, consider the following letter from a preschool child to her teacher:

Mrs. West, I am so excited. I am spending the weekend with my real father and my brother is spending the weekend with his real father and my sister is spending the weekend with her real father. My mother is spending a relaxing weekend at home

alone - unless her boyfriend comes by (Latham, 1994, p. 1).

Not only does this child's "weekend report" sound confusing, but the described scenario is becoming all too common. In the last three decades (1960-1990), the percentage of children living separately from their biological fathers has more than doubled, from 17 to 36 percent (Popenoe, 1996). At this rate, by the year 2000, it is plausible that nearly fifty percent of American children will grow up without the presence of their biological father in the home (Edmundson, 1995; King, 1994; Popenoe, 1996).

"Father absence" is a term that is all too often directed towards men who are missing from the home. However, just because a father merely "lives on the premises" should not imply that he is doing an adequate job as a father. In fact, there may be more disengaged fathers in America than absent ones. Disengaged fathers are men who *physically* live with their children, but who are *emotionally* detached (Balcom, 1998). Therefore, *fatherlessness* can be a dilemma even if the father is present in the home.

What are the causes of father-son disengagement? Aside from divorce and single-parenthood, there are work-related factors that can contribute to father-son separation. For instance, fathers today spend more of their time commuting and working than fathers of the past - 54 hours per week (Rossi, 1996). In fact, with many mothers in the workforce, married couples now work an average of more than 80 hours a week (Freeman, Carlson, & Sperry, 1993). Both fathers and mothers who work are often "drained" at the end of a long day and frequently do not have the time or energy to devote towards their children (Shapiro, 1997). Consequently, today's fathers spend less time in

child-related activities than they have in years past (Robinson & Godbey, 1997). Simply, fathers who spend more time at the office have less time for their sons.

Regardless of the reason for father-son withdraw, the disengaged father movement has not occurred over night; it has evolved over a long period of time. One family therapist has argued that for the last few hundred years now, each generation of fathers has passed on less power, less wisdom, and less love to their sons. It appears that as a culture, we have reached the point where many fathers are largely irrelevant in their sons' lives' (Pittman, 1993). Unfortunately, father irrelevance is not healthy; in fact, it is dangerous not only to families, but to our entire social system (Blankenhorn, 1995; Popenoe, 1996). Besides youth violence, researchers have linked fatherlessness with teen pregnancy, domestic violence, child sexual abuse, and child poverty (Balcom, 1998; Blankenhorn, 1995; Edmundson, 1995; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Low, 1996; Margolin, 1992; Popenoe, 1996). In both senses of absence and disengagement, fatherlessness is considered by some experts to be the central social problem of our contemporary society (Blankenhorn, 1995; Low, 1996).

It is the opinion of this researcher that, for the sake of children and society, fathers must restore what has been lost and insert themselves back into their homes. The proponents of fatherhood are not seeking a world "for fathers only," nor proposing that fathers are better than, or even equal to mothers (Whitehead, 1993; Popenoe, 1996). Advocates of fatherhood know that the evidence is clear - the well being of families, and subsequently society, improves when the father takes an active role in the home and works

along side the mother in raising a family (Whitehead, 1993). After 20 years of research on the subject, David Popenoe, a sociologist from Rutgers University has concluded: "I know of few other bodies of evidence whose weight leans so much in one direction as does the evidence about family structure: On the whole, two parents - a father and mother - are better for the child than one parent" (1996, p. 8).

Father involvement is crucial when considering the well being of today's children. Although a "well-spring" of research has recently documented trends of absent fathers and dead-beat dads (Blankenhorn, 1995), the 90s have also welcomed an era of nurturing men who care about their children and want to be involved in their lives (Hawkins & Dollahite, 1997). These are not men who merely provide monetarily; research has acknowledged that many contemporary fathers are also contributing intellectually and emotionally to their offspring (Hawkins & Dollahite, 1997; Woodworth, Belsky, & Crnic, 1996). In fact, as we approach a new Century, "[i]t seems that American fathers are increasingly likely to be nurturing family men than the distant providers and protectors they once were" (MacKey, 1998, p. 228). The well being of children from such families is much higher when compared to those children who are fatherless or who have disengaged fathers (Harris, Furstenberg, & Marmer, 1998). Arguably, contemporary fathers are more involved with their children than previous generations; however, there is still much room for improvement (Balcom, 1998; Dollahite, 1998; and Steinberg, 1987).

#### Problem Statement

Lately, there has been a considerable amount of research documenting the societal



ills of a fatherless society (Bennett, 1993; Blankenhorn, 1995; Edmundson, 1995; Feder, 1994; King, 1994; Low, 1996; Popenoe, 1996; Whitehead, 1993). Unfortunately, only scant and limited research has focused upon other fatherhood issues, such as father-child relationships during the life-course. Although it is known that fathers and daughters tend to separate from each other during the daughter's adolescence (Beaumont, 1996; Ge, Conger, Lorenz, Shanahan, & Elder, 1995; Greene & Grimsley, 1990; Harris, Furstenberg, & Marmer, 1998; Hill, Holmbeck, Marlow, Green, & Lynch, 1985; Steinberg, 1988), it appears that little is known about fathers and their relationships with their own adolescent sons. Yet, a satisfactory father-son relationships can benefit families and society (Blankenhorn, 1995; Griswold, 1993; Popenoe, 1996). In fact, a father-son relationship, where the son can identify and converse and learn from his father is crucial to male adolescent development (D'Angelo, Weinberger, & Feldman, 1995; Popenoe, 1996; Snarey, 1993). The father role is critical in the development of adolescent males, and therefore should be examined thoroughly.

The purpose of this study is to examine the father-son relationship among 6th through 12th graders. Family scholars have reported that during puberty, father-daughter relationships become emotionally distant as sex-roles are redefined (Ge, Conger, Lorenz, Shanahan, & Elder, 1995; Steinberg, 1987). Are the same tendencies present within the father-son dyad before, during and after puberty? Do fathers and sons disengage from each other during male adolescence? Is it common for a father to demonstrate less physical affection towards his son during puberty (as is the case with father-daughter

relationships during adolescence)? Such questions deserve attention and explanation. Moderating variables such as time together, common interests and SES should also be taken into consideration.

### Research Objectives

Research indicates that the parent-child relationship, and specifically parent-child interactions, are the most robust predictors of life-satisfaction among adolescents (Young, Miller, Norton, & Hill, 1995). When parents are supportive, adolescents tend to have high self-esteem, advanced cognitive ability, academic success, an internal locus of control, advanced moral development, exhibit considerate and altruistic behaviors towards others, and overall, engage in more prosocial behaviors when compared to adolescents who do not have supportive parents (Amato, 1990; see also Barber & Thomas, 1986). Therefore, a satisfactory father-son relationship is conducive to individual and family satisfaction. However, family relationships are often strained during adolescence (Sinkkonen, Anttila, & Siimes, 1998). Specifically, the pubertal transition has proven to be a difficult, disruptive, and a challenging time for the adolescent, as well as for the immediate family (Ge et al., 1995; Greene & Grimsley, 1990; Papini & Sebby, 1987; Steinberg, 1987). In fact, fathers report higher dissatisfaction with the parent-child relationship during peak puberty than at any other time of adolescence (Green & Grimsley, 1990; Papini & Sebby, 1987). Additional studies report that pubertal maturation is associated with adolescent aloofness, dissatisfaction, poor communication, and ultimately, conflict in the parent-child relationship (Beaumont, 1996; Steinberg, 1988). Steinberg (1988) further reported that

father-son conflict is most frequent during the son's apex (mid-puberty) of puberty, and that the emotional distance between fathers and sons is greatest during the pubertal apex (See also Greene & Grimsley, 1990).

Aside from chemical and hormonal influences, the adolescent's continued struggle for both autonomy and connectedness can be a potentially tense situation. The adolescent desires to be independent by reducing "...the intensity of . . . childhood bonds" (Newman, 1989, p. 915) while at the same time trying to remain inconspicuously dependent. The balance is delicate, and often finding such equilibrium is the source of contention and distress in many households. Meanwhile, "[t]he desire for fathers to have their sons be like them may be frustrated by the simultaneous emphasis on building independence and encouraging autonomous decision making for boys" (Newman, 1989, p. 919). Even more turmoil is created by both parents as the father continues his crusade for adolescent independence, while the mother pleads for cohesion and connectedness (Newman, 1989).

Theoretically, Erikson's concept of *identity* is useful in explaining these tendencies for both the son and his father. For example, Erikson described puberty as "a time of life when the body changes its proportions radically" (1968, p. 132). Such changes can propel the young male adolescent into one of the most profound identity crises life has to offer. Not only is the male adolescent experiencing physical changes in his body, but his emotional state can also become unbalanced. In essence, the young adolescent's identity comes into question as he asks himself, "Who am I?" Instead of attaching and confiding in his father during this time of need, young males often turn towards their peer group in

order to “help one another temporarily through such discomfort by forming cliques and stereotyping themselves, their ideals, and their enemies” (Erikson, 1968, p. 133; see also Hill, Holmbeck, Marlow, Green, & Lynch, 1985). Therefore, distance is perpetuated between the son and his father.

Meanwhile, as the son navigates his way through puberty, his father could be experiencing mid-life identity problems of his own (MacDermid & Crouter, 1995). According to Erikson, fathers in mid-life enter a stage of generativity vs self-absorption and stagnation; generativity is the need and concern to guide the next generation (Erikson, 1963), while self-absorption suggests disregarding the next generation and focusing on the self. Consider that at this point in life, many fathers are dealing with the nagging questions of mid-life reassessment or the pressures of their job or career; certainly, at this juncture, both the father and son could be asking themselves the same questions: “Who am I?” and “Where am I going?” (Martin, 1985). Moreover, Erikson further argues that at this point, young male adolescents need independence, while mature men “[need] to be needed” (Erikson, 1963, pp. 266-267). Inevitably, these conflicting needs may increase friction unless they are negotiated carefully. Therefore, Erikson’s theory is useful in addressing father and son involvement during puberty, because it addresses the psychosocial context of both the father and the son, as well as the concept of identity.

The objectives of this study are to:

1. Determine if there is a relationship between adolescent male physical development and male adolescent identity development.

2. Determine if male adolescent physical development mediates the paternal (father)/male-adolescent (son) relationship. Particularly, does puberty influence paternal/adolescent distancing and involvement?
3. Determine if there is a relationship between paternal (father) psychosocial development and male adolescent (son) identity development.
4. Determine if the relationship between paternal/male adolescent psychosocial development mediates father/son involvement.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There appears to be substantial evidence that fathers play a critical role in the development of their own sons (Harris, Furstenberg, & Marmer, 1998; MacKey, 1998; McBride & Rane, 1998); however, during the onset of puberty, both fathers and sons appear to withdraw from each other (Greene & Grimsley, 1990). Erikson's theory of psychosocial development is useful in explaining distancing patterns as well as addressing the crucial issue of adult and adolescent identity. To better understand father and son involvement during puberty, developmental outcomes of father-son involvement will be presented, and the importance of father-son involvement will be reviewed. Erikson's theory of psychosocial development will also be highlighted and utilized to explain father-son distancing.

#### Developmental Outcomes of Father-Involvement

Although there is clear evidence that many men are "dead-beat dads" or physically absent from their children, the 1990s has become the decade of the "new father" (Harris, Marmer, & Furstenberg, 1998; Blankenhorn, 1995). Fathers of the 90s have perhaps been more involved with their children than any other recent decade. Research has documented that fathers are important because they can contribute to the well being of their children (Popenoe, 1996). Particularly, fathers can provide a masculine role model (Gallagher, 1998) for their sons and teach them how to ultimately become responsible fathers themselves (Doherty et al., 1990).

Popenoe (1996) has contended that fathers typically emphasize physical activity and play over care taking; hence, play and interaction with their sons is more of a "rough and tumble approach." Mothers tend to be more nurturing and responsive to their children's needs, whereas fathers are more firm. Furthermore, mothers emphasize emotional security and relationships, while fathers encourage competition and risk-taking (Popenoe, 1996). Both perspectives, and hence, both parents, are vital to the healthy development of children (Whitehead, 1993).

However, as with motherhood, becoming an involved father does not come without significant effort and sacrifice. As contemporary fathers are being pulled in many different directions, they must make some choices that will impact their families (Balcom, 1998). Fathering expert, David Dollahite, has explained:

Research has clearly shown that the quantity and quality of father involvement - even more than mother involvement - is strongly influenced by institutional practices, employment opportunities, cultural expectations, and social support.

Most men desire to be good fathers, yet they face significant challenges stemming from increasing economic, societal, and familial changes, demands, and complexities (1998, p. 1).

Popenoe (1996) contends that many contemporary and cultural influences actually discourage fathers from being involved with their children. In fact, "Popenoe goes so far as to argue that if a culture were specifically designed to be unfriendly to strong father-child ties, it would not look much different from that of contemporary American culture"

(Dollahite, 1998, p. 1). Hence, fathers are supposed to be primary economic providers which translates often times into many hours away from home. Conversely, men are also expected to be “nurturing dads” which requires more time spent at home, assisting with domestic duties (Griswold, 1993). Perhaps many fathers feel trapped by this controversy.

Whether the father chooses to be actively involved with his family, or pursue other directions, there will be consequences. Research indicates that if the father is absent from the home, young male adolescents often have difficulty “fitting-in” and adjusting to society (Blankenhorn, 1995). In his book, *Fatherless America*, David Blankenhorn (1995) has documented that children who are raised without the presence of a father in the home are more prone (than children who live with their fathers) to a) become involved in youth violence, b) participate in domestic violence, c) become victims of sexual abuse, d) experience child poverty and economic insecurity, and e) become teenage parents. Snarey (1993), on the other hand, has demonstrated that when fathers are involved and spend time with their sons, these young men tend to advance academically, athletically, and socially.

Furthermore, in a recent study, family scholars analyzed *The National Survey of Children*, focusing on father-child relationships during adolescence. These scholars posited that a fathers’ involvement with his children contributes directly to their intellectual and emotional well being. Specifically, they reported that

Several studies have demonstrated that fathers can have a positive impact on their children’s development...and have long term effects...In particular, supporting



parenting behaviors in which the father provides expressive and instrumental affection, nurturance, interest, and companionship enhance children's self-esteem, life satisfaction, and social competence ... This supportive dimension of paternal involvement, reflecting the "new active father" role, also influences several behavioral outcomes of children, including delinquency, adolescent drinking, and other problem behaviors (Harris, Furstenberg, & Marmer, 1998, pp. 201-202).

The evidence is clear. Children need both mothers *and* fathers to enhance their optimal development. The call, however, is not merely for parents to reside with their children. Much more is needed than that. Parents, especially fathers, must do more than grace their children with their presence. They must be actively involved in their children's lives (Harris et al., 1998; Hawkins & Dollahite, 1997).

#### Beyond Father Presence: Father and Son Involvement

It is the opinion of this researcher that quality and nurturing relationships must be established and maintained between fathers and their sons. Research seems to indicate that a healthy father and son relationship is beneficial to both parties. Dr. Frank Pittman, a marriage and family therapist, has contended that

What goes on between father and son - and what does not go on between them - is surely the most important determinant of whether the boy will become a man capable of giving life to others or whether he will go through life ashamed and pulling back from exposure to intimacy with men, women, and children (1993, p. 54).

Additionally, fathers provide models of behavior for children, particularly sons (Lamb, 1981; Snarey, 1993) in their future place as protectors and providers. The nature of this interaction may best be understood by adopting Rogoff's (1990) concept of "apprenticeship." Fathers thus engage their sons in guided participation by building bridges from a boy's present understanding and skills to acquire new understanding and skills. Fathers engage in this bridge building as they structure and arrange for their son's participation in activities. Such interaction lies at the root of paternal involvement.

Although research substantiates that father involvement contributes significantly to the behavioral, cognitive, and affective development of their sons (Snarey, 1993). What have not been discussed are the factors that contribute to adequate involvement, participation, or engagement. Generally, Barber (1997) has contended that there are three crucial needs in the development of adolescents: 1) *connection*, which implies a consistent, stable, positive, emotional connection with significant others. Such a bond seems to equip children with important social skills and a sense of security; 2) *regulation*, which suggests adequate supervision, monitoring, and rule setting; and 3) *autonomy*, which facilitates independence and individuation. It is widely recognized that adolescents need to establish their own independence and sensitive fathers will alter their patterns of involvement with their sons in order to give them the space they need for growth and maturity (Palkovitz, 1997).

Nevertheless, if connection, regulation and autonomy are necessary in the healthy development of adolescents, what type of involvement would incorporate these necessary

elements? The answer lies in Lamb's *topology of paternal involvement*, with three dimensions to be considered: 1) interaction/engagement (the father and son interacting together); 2) accessibility (father being available to his son); and 3) responsibility (knowing the sons needs and then deciding how to respond) (Lamb, 1986; see also Doherty et al., 1998; McBride & Rane, 1998). Connection, autonomy and regulation can be achieved within each of these dimensions.

Palkovitz (1997) has argued that father involvement tends to vary across time in relation to social ecology and life circumstances. What is good for the pre-teen might not be good for the young adult. At this juncture, father involvement will be discussed at pre (before), trans (mid), and post (after) puberty.

#### **Pre-puberty: Father and Son Proximity**

First, most father and son interaction occurs at the *interaction / engagement* level (McBride, 1989) during the pre-pubertal years. One study revealed that "paternal engagement with young children was from 2.0 to 2.8 hours per day, with 1.9 hours on weekdays and 6.5 hours on weekends" (Doherty et al., 1998, p. 283). Prior to the onset of puberty, interaction or involvement can occur on three levels: behavioral, affective, and cognitive (See Palkovitz, 1997). The behavioral domain includes observable actions, such as conversing or playing basketball together; the affectional domain includes activities that pertain to emotions and feelings, such as embracing or encouraging; the cognitive domain would include activities such as reasoning, planning, or doing homework together.

Like Palkovitz, Snarey (1993) also has defined three domains of involved or

generative fathers. The first domain, social-emotional development, includes such activities as the father and son playing games together, visiting relatives, or the father buying a home to provide a non-delinquent neighborhood for his son. The second domain, intellectual-academic development, includes fathers reading to their sons, helping them with homework, or taking them to a museum. The third domain, physical-athletic development, entails fathers teaching their sons how to swim, explaining personal hygiene, or monitoring nutrition.

There are many different dimensions of father-involvement, and subsequently, there are many activities fathers and sons can participate in together. Aside from the traditional father and son throwing the football to each other, fathers and their sons can also work on projects together, participate in scouting activities, challenge each other intellectually, and work in the yard. An example of father and son involvement across the intellectual dimension includes research on low-income fathers and the academic performance of their sons. Levine (1993) has documented that when fathers are involved with their children in the *Head Start* program, their children report higher adjustment and social competence when compared to children who do not have their fathers involved in the program.

Secondly, according to Lamb (1986), accessibility is a critical aspect of paternal involvement. Between the ages of 3 and 12, fathers should be *accessible* to their sons. If a father is not accessible to his son, does the son have any advantage over those peers who do not have a father at all? Research suggests that the effects of absent fathers on their

children are detrimental (Popenoe, 1996; Blankenhorn, 1995). Therefore, many fathers today are making attempts to be home more and a part of their children's lives. In fact, with so many mothers in the work force, studies show that some fathers are a significant source of primary child care. "Twenty-three percent of families with a working mother have a father who serves as the primary parent while the mother works" (Doherty et al., 1998, p. 284).

Third, Lamb (1986) argues that the final level of involvement suggests that the father is responsible for the *welfare* and care for his son. Indeed, fathers must provide for the needs of their sons, which can include monetary support to finance activities such as sports involvement, extracurricular activities at school, assisted learning equipment such as computers and calculators, and of course, food, shelter, and clothing. Moreover, fathers should be actively involved in the future welfare of their sons by setting goals with them, discussing careers, and planning for college and professions. For many fathers, these three levels of Lamb's model occur in varying degrees, until the son reaches puberty.

#### **Trans and Post-puberty: Connectedness vs Individuation**

As the son approaches puberty, adolescence and the transition to adulthood, he and his father begin to separate (Papini & Sebby, 1987; Simmons & Blyth, 1987; Steinberg, 1987). This period is a highly emotional time between a father and son. It appears that the son begins to retreat from the "ego-blending" relationship of himself and his father. That is, the son now seeks his own identity, his own life philosophy and begins to make his own decisions. Moreover, the son seems to want the security of knowing that

his father is *accessible*; however, he also feels the compelling need to find his own individual identity by separating from his father and drawing closer to his peers (Erikson, 1963; Yablonsky, 1990). Therefore, *interaction* decreases (Pappini & Sebbi, 1987; Steinberg, 1988).

Puberty, argues Erikson (1963), becomes the catalyst of an adolescent identity crisis. What has been stable for years is now changing: The male adolescent's voice is deepening, his body is growing pubic hair under his arms and on his genitals and his beard is developing. Viewed from a psychosocial lens, not only does adolescent male puberty directly impact the son physically and emotionally, but indirectly as the dynamics of the entire family system are affected.

Puberty signals the beginning of the adolescent's struggle with individuation versus connectedness. Individuality is characterized by separateness and self-assertion while connection suggests mutuality and permeability (Adams, Dyk, & Bennion, 1990). There is a need and place for both individuation and connectedness and if the adolescent son and mid-life father are to achieve satisfaction in the relationship, the balance between these two variables must be discovered (Clark-Lempers, Lempers, & Ho, 1991).

The hallmark of this time period is distancing between adolescent sons and their parents (Steinberg, 1988); hence, the struggle of individuation versus connectedness heightens. Traditionally, as boys become older and encounter adolescence and puberty, they become more distant from their parents and do fewer things with their families (Greene & Grimsley, 1990; Harris & Morgan, 1991; Steinberg, 1988). Simmons and

Blyth (1987) reported that "Pubertal change...acts as a cue to significant others that a new set of rights and obligations is relevant, and that a new and different age-role should be assumed" (p. 131). In summary, "Pubertal status has been empirically linked to increased distance and dissatisfaction in the parent-child relationship" (MacDermid & Crouter, 1995, p. 32; See also Sagrestano, McCormick, Paikoff, & Holmbeck, 1999; Sinkkonen, Anttila, & Siimes, 1998 ). Thus, as the son experiences the transformation of puberty, the father must redefine his own role. What kind of involvement is acceptable? How involved should the father be? For various reasons, instead of pursuing those questions and dilemmas, and ultimately coming to some form of what is appropriate and acceptable, many fathers and sons tend to withdraw from each other (Papini & Sebbi, 1987).

After studying the effects of puberty on families for over 20 years, Steinberg has concluded: "These studies all indicate that pubertal maturation, independent of chronological age, is associated with adolescent aloofness, dissatisfaction, or conflict in the parent-child relationship" (Steinberg, 1989, p. 78). Family conflict and adolescent dissatisfaction appears to be most intense during the adolescent males pubertal apex (Sagrestano, McCormick, Paikoff, & Holmbeck, 1999; Sinkkonen, Anttila, & Siimes, 1998; Greene & Grimsley, 1990). Such conflict obviously impacts father and son emotional closeness.

During the apex of puberty, paternal involvement appears to decrease on the dimensions of *engagement* and *accessibility*. In terms of time spent together, paternal involvement decreases dramatically during adolescence, from 2.0 to 2.8 hours a day down

to .5 to 1.0 hour per day (Doherty et al., 1998). Peer relationships and extra-curricular activities draw the son away from home (Erikson, 1963). Thus, for the young adolescent male, friends become the primary source of companionship; parents are still important for affection, reliable alliance, enhancement of worth, and instrumental aid (Clark-Lempers, Lempers, & Ho, 1991).

Meanwhile, fathers often become occupied with the pressures of middle age. It appears that during this time period: (a) men tend to engage in self-evaluation and introspection. They become reflective on how they are succeeding in life and begin to seriously consider what they have accomplished. Interestingly, this shift is prompted by the way time is perceived. Instead of time and age being viewed from birth, a change occurs; now most men view time and age as "time left." (b) Social and familial relationships become especially salient. Children are leaving the nest, parents are either dead or dying, and retirement looms in the near-distant future. The consequences of unsuccessfully negotiating mid life concerns often leads to such conditions as depression, anxiety, boredom, disillusionment, and fear (MacDermid & Crouter, 1995).

Consequently, it seems that many mid-life men busy themselves with something they seem to have some control over - their professions. Dienhart and Daly (1997) contend that fathers live in a *performance* culture, and they spend most of their time seeking the "touted rewards" of the money economy, while sometimes neglecting paternal responsibilities. Perhaps this too, contributes to father and son distancing.

From an evolutionary standpoint, Steinberg (1989) contends that there are two



primary reasons for conflict and distance among fathers and sons during puberty. First, although there are certain conflicts regarding household chores, curfews, and friends, Steinberg contends that the “ultimate cause of conflict between adolescents and parents is the need to distance youngsters from their parents, in order that mating will take place outside the family group” (1989, p. 93). Secondly, Steinberg argues that our industrialized society has prolonged adolescent economic dependence upon parents, and subsequently, lengthened the stay of adolescents in the home. Instead of young men leaving home at age 13 or when they reach physical maturity, today many young men are staying home into their mid-twenties. “Taken together, these two changes resulted in a sizeable increase in the amount of time that sexually mature youngsters and their parents must live in close contact with one another...Today, sexually mature youngsters may spend seven or eight years in their parents’ homes” (Steinberg, 1989, p. 93).

What is needed during puberty, among other things, is an understanding and nurturing father who can make the experience more bearable, more understandable, and more reasonable. This is a pivotal time for a father and his son. Yablonsky (1990) has argued that

If the normal problems that emerge in this phase are not handled properly, the relationship can become a lifelong disaster for both father and son. Fuel can be thrown on the normal adolescent father-son fire and cause a major conflagration ...Immature, macho, emotionally weak fathers will react as peers and outsiders, often in defense of their own weak egos” (1990, pp. 95, 97).

On the other hand, Mace (1953) argues that a son who looks up to his dad and enjoys the time they spend together will accept his own masculine role readily, without much turmoil. Furthermore, when fathers are involved with their sons as they move through adolescence, fathers are reported to be more accepting and have a more healthy relationship with them (Almeida & Galambos, 1991). Thus, an understanding father with a solid sense of identity will allow his son to test out new emotions, ideas, and behaviors without negative consequences. In fact, a good father will take the time to provide an “experimental” environment for his son. Moreover, a father with a healthy identity of his own will gracefully become his son’s auxiliary ego during the adolescent’s difficult role-testing period between childhood and manhood (Yablonsky, 1990). Clearly, “[b]oys cannot become whole men without men ...making them into men” (Gurian, 1996). But, it takes a good man to make a good man. Nevertheless, the transition through puberty can be more bearable if the father and son have a positive relationship.

#### Erikson and Conceptual Framework

A prevailing notion in our contemporary society is that *fathering* is a social role which men usually perform inadequately at best (Hawkins & Dollahite, 1997). Such a paradigm is derived from a deficit model evident in family scholarship pertaining to men and fathers. Although there is some relevance to the deficit model, the notion fails to accurately portray successful fathers (Hawkins & Dollahite, 1997).

Snarey (1993) argues for an Eriksonian approach to fatherhood -a macro theory that has been a workhorse in the social sciences for years. In fact, over the past four

decades, Erikson's theory of psychosocial development has been used in many facets, especially adolescent and psychosocial issues. However, the model has seen limited use in its assessment of adult concerns (Hawkins & Dollahite, 1997).

Nevertheless, the father-son relationship can be examined carefully with the help of Erikson's theory of psychosocial development. Erikson posited that there are eight stages of life: Trust vs Basic Mistrust; Autonomy vs Shame and Doubt; Initiative vs Guilt; Industry vs Inferiority; Identity vs Role Confusion; Intimacy vs Isolation; Generativity vs Self-Absorption, Stagnation; and Ego Integrity vs Despair. Each of these stages of development is related in a universal sequence. Thus, one passes through these eight stages sequentially. Due to the nature and scope of this paper, it will not be necessary to explain each Eriksonian stage in detail; however, the first four stages demand further attention. These early stages of psychosocial development lead to stage five, Identity vs Role Confusion, which is the focal point of this research.

#### **Trust vs Mistrust**

The first stage of psychosocial development, trust vs mistrust, occurs during the first year of a child's life. In this stage, the infant commences interaction with a primary caretaker, usually the mother. In fact, "...the amount of trust derived from the earliest infantile experiences ...depends... on the quality of the maternal relationship" (Erikson, 1963, p. 249). Therefore, when an infant begins to sense that their primary caretaker is consistent and dependable, they develop a sense of trust in their care giver. Hence, the infant knows that there is someone they can count on - someone who will be there for

them.

Moreover, not only does the infant learn that they can rely and trust their mother due to her consistent and predictable responses, but they begin to trust themselves (Erikson, 1963). Erikson argued that the “..infant’s first social achievement, then, is his willingness to let the mother out of sight without undue anxiety or rage, because she has become an inner certainty as well as an outer predictability” (1963, p. 247). The ability to trust oneself and others becomes the basis for the child’s sense of identity (Erikson, 1963).

#### **Autonomy vs Shame and Doubt**

The second Eriksonian stage, which occurs between the ages of one and three, is autonomy vs shame and doubt. This stage is characterized by holding on and letting go - a process that facilitates choice. Hence, the child has the ability to discriminate and then, decide whether to hold on to something or relinquish it. In making such choices and decisions, the child is exercising their sense of autonomy (Crain, 1992). A two-year olds most prolific way to express such autonomy is by saying “no” to practically everything, refusing to be potty-trained, or screaming at the check-out stand of the grocery store until they get what they want. Shame and doubt emerge as social counterbalances to the child’s will in exercising choice. Erikson explained that “[Shame]...is essentially rage turned against the self. He who is ashamed would like to force the world not to look at him, not to notice his exposure” (1963, p. 252). Therefore, shame occurs when the child feels that he/she does not look good when viewed by others (Crain, 1992).

Doubt is facilitated by the feeling that the child is not as powerful as they initially

thought but vulnerable and able to be controlled by others (Erikson, 1963). Erikson has added that this “basic sense of doubt ...forms a substratum for later and more verbal forms of compulsive doubting” (1963, p. 254) which certainly affects identity.

### **Initiative vs Guilt**

Between the ages of three and six, the child enters the third stage of psychosocial development: Initiative vs Guilt implies ambition, drive, motivation, and enterprise. Hence, a child that has initiative moves forward, makes plans and overcomes the obstacles set in his/her path (Crain, 1992). It was Erikson’s belief that the “danger of this stage is a sense of guilt over the goals contemplated and the acts initiated in one’s exuberant enjoyment of new locomotor and mental power” (1963, p. 255) or as Crain explained, the crisis occurs when “children realize that their biggest plans and fondest hopes are doomed for failure” (1992, p. 254). Hence, there is an incongruence between what is happening and what should be happening. Nevertheless, children who succeed in their plans and goals and who overcome will eventually develop a healthy sense of initiative while those who “live” in their guilt, will not.

### **Industry vs Inferiority**

Between the ages of six to eleven, Erikson viewed children in the stage of development known as industry vs inferiority. In this stage, sexual and aggressive drives are temporarily suspended (the calm before the pubertal storm), and the child is often more tranquil, composed and secure when compared to other stages of psychosocial development. Identity is fostered and nurtured through creativity and production. Thus,

children learn “to win recognition by producing things” (Erikson, 1963, p. 259) and adjusting themselves to the tool world.

So, the child gains competence by mastering tasks, skills, and talents that enable him/her to interact successfully with the environment. Erikson warned, however, that the danger of this stage “lies in a sense of inadequacy and inferiority. If he despairs of his tools and skills or of his status among his tool partners, his ego boundaries suffer and he abandons hope for the ability to identify early with others who apply themselves to the same general section of the tool world” (Erikson, 1963, p. 260). Thus, there is a prevailing need for the child to be accepted and successful in his/her own environment. To be successful by producing, whether that production entails making an “A” on the spelling test, or improving one’s music ability, can lead to a healthy identity. The inverse is equally true, the lack of productivity yields low self-concept and high inadequacy.

#### **Identity vs Role Confusion**

As “teens” approach adolescence, they also enter the fifth stage of psychosocial development: identity vs role confusion. At this juncture, latent sexual drives emerge which can overwhelm the adolescent. Furthermore, at this stage, childhood ends, and puberty/adolescence begins (Erikson, 1963). Besides sexual urges, new social conflicts and responsibilities also confuse adolescents. In fact, Erikson postulated that this phase of the life cycle is a time of growing and ideological commitment (Marcia, 1966). Nonetheless, the adolescent's primary task is establishing a new sense of *ego identity*, a feeling for who one is and for one’s place in the larger society (Crain, 1992). In this stage

of development, the adolescent can “sometimes morbidly, often curiously, [be] preoccupied with what they appear to be in the eyes of others as compared with what they feel they are, and with the question of how to connect the roles and skills cultivated earlier with the ideal prototypes of the day” (Erikson, 1968, p. 128). For example, adolescents begin to define themselves by the groups with whom they associate. This grouping is a process of finding and confirming identity. The question of “Who am I” is actively pursued.

Why is *identity* such a *crisis*? Because “in the social jungle of human existence there is no feeling of being alive without a sense of identity” (Erikson, 1968, p. 130). Without identity, there is no purpose, direction, or motivation. Thus, a *moratorium* can sometimes be just what the doctor ordered. During this moratorium, the adolescent “aborts the mission” and seeks for solace and peace and identity. Some join the army, others back pack across Europe, while most appear to stay close to home. Nevertheless, these young people are seeking “their place under the sun” as they attempt to decipher who they really are.

At this stage of the young adolescent male’s life, a mentor is crucial. It was Erikson’s belief that

If the earliest stage bequeathed to the identity crisis an important need for trust in oneself and in others, then clearly the adolescent looks most fervently for *men* and ideas to have faith in, which also means *men* and ideas in whose service it would seem worth while to prove oneself trustworthy (Erikson, 1968, p. 129; emphasis

added).

Who are these mentors that adolescent males can look to for guidance and direction through the pubertal storms of life? Some are coaches, a few are teachers, but many are fathers. It is the father that can be there for the adolescent to explore with and against; it is the father who can provide limits so the adolescent can discover boundaries; it is the father who can provide support and succor to the wandering adolescent who is frightened and insecure; it is the father that can be a pillar of strength and example to the unsure and struggling teen (Josselson, 1994).

### *Psychosocial Status*

Martin (1985) has argued that if there were one word to capsule the father-adolescent relationship, it would be *identity*. When speaking of identity, however, a bi-directional paradigm should be considered. For example, Martin explained,

As the adolescent struggles with his or her emerging identity, the father struggles with the nagging questions of the mid-life reassessment or the pressure of establishing himself in a career. When the two collide in the uncertainty and confusion of 'Who am I and where am I going,' the consequences can be devastating for both sides...All of the attributes of normal adolescent development seem to interfere with a close father-child relationship. The adolescent push toward an independent identity is at times expressed in the defiant rejection of a caring father. The adolescent's insecurity and moodiness may push the father away at times when the father, too, is looking for recognition and affirmation of his lifestyle



decisions (p. 176).

It could be argued that much of the father-son conflict that occurs during adolescence is, as Martin argued, rooted in identity. It was Newman's contention that "[t]he desire for fathers to have their sons be like them may be frustrated by the simultaneous emphasis on building independence and encouraging autonomous decision making for boys" (1989, p. 919). Further, the adolescent's youthful invulnerability could also be threatening to his father, who may be struggling, with actual and anticipated losses at mid life (MacDermid & Crouter, 1995, p. 32). In fact, developmental success for mid-life fathers and their teenage sons, perhaps more than any other pair of coinciding tasks, requires a high degree of cooperation. For the son to successfully individuate, the father must be willing to abdicate some control. Likewise, for the father to achieve a sense of generativity and successfully resolve his own mid-life issues, the adolescent son must allow himself to be guided and directed (MacDermid & Crouter, 1995).

Erikson "saw the formation of a personal sense of identity (versus identity diffusion) as one of the cornerstones of ego development" (Patterson, Sochting, & Marcia, 1992, p. 9). In each stage of Erikson's theory, the individual has a psychosocial task to master. The confrontation with each task creates conflict with two possible outcomes. If the conflict is negotiated successfully, a positive quality is incorporated into the personality and further development occurs. If the conflict persists or is resolved unsatisfactorily, the ego becomes damaged. It is the overall task of individuals to acquire a positive ego identity as they move from one stage to the next. It was Erikson's belief

that “stages progress in a definite order that is linked to social expectations and bodily maturation” (Patterson, Sochting, & Marcia, 1992, p. 10).

According to Erikson, there are three essential elements for a sense of identity. First, the adolescent must experience inner sameness (integrity) so that actions and decisions are not made randomly. Second, the sense of inner sameness is continuous over time. Finally, identity is experienced within the context and community of important others (Patterson, Sochting, & Marcia, 1992).

Identity appears to be the total concept of self. Moreover, identity does not begin nor end with adolescence; it is a lifelong process. In order to establish identity, individuals must evaluate their strengths and deficiencies (Rice, 1999). Components of identity include physical, sexual, social, vocational, moral, ideological, and psychological aspects. Hence, there is more to identity than appearance or intellect.

Building upon the identity work of Erikson, Marcia developed an identity status approach to studying the process of identity formation. Marcia (1966), like Erikson (1963), argued that identity achievement and identity diffusion are the polarized outcomes of the psychosocial crisis that occurs in late adolescence. Moreover, “Marcia’s four identity statuses occupy unique positions along the dimensions of *exploration* and *commitment*” (Patterson, Sochting, & Marcia, 1992, p. 9; emphasis added). Exploration, which was earlier labeled as a crisis, refers to the adolescent’s period of engaging in, and then, selecting meaningful alternatives. Commitment, on the other hand, refers to the degree of personal investment the adolescent demonstrates (Marcia, 1966). Marcia’s four

identity statuses include:

1. Identity diffusion: Low commitment and low exploration characterize this status. With diffusion, there is no commitment to a consistent set of values or goals. In fact, exploration is non-existent or superficial. "People in identity diffusion tend to follow the path of least resistance, and may present as having a carefree, cosmopolitan lifestyle, and/or as being empty or dissatisfied" (Patterson, Sochting, & Marcia, 1992, p. 11). Moreover, such individuals have neither surveyed various values, beliefs, or occupational choices, and therefore, have not committed to any lifestyle (White & Jones, 1996). These adolescents tend to be impulsive, and highly influenced by temporary thrills or fads. They live for Friday night, so to speak, not considering or contemplating future consequences. Moreover, the diffused adolescent is easily influenced by peers and has a poor self-concept. They may, or may not have experienced a period of crisis (Marcia, 1966).
2. Identity foreclosure: A high level of commitment with little or no exploration typify this status. Such individuals rarely engage in questioning. Moreover, "People who follow the foreclosure pattern adopt a single set of values and goals, usually those of their parents" (Patterson, Sochting, & Marcia, 1992, pp. 11-12). Foreclosed adolescents have a strong need for social approval, are obedient and compliant, and look at authority figures in order to make decisions. Such adolescents are engaged "becoming what others have prepared or intended [them] to become as a child" (Marcia, 1966, p. 552). Usually these adolescents do what

they are told.

3. Moratorium: This stage emphasizes a low commitment, yet a high level of exploration. Hence a moratorium refers to the process of forging an identity through the exploration of a myriad of possibilities. These individuals are searching for relevant answers (White & Jones, 1996). "The person in moratorium is intensely preoccupied with exploring options and working toward commitment" (Patterson, Sochting, & Marcia, 1992, p. 12). Adolescents in moratorium possess a high level of moral reasoning and judgement. Furthermore, they are self-directed, active, social, resistant to peer pressure and open to alternatives. Ultimately, the process of moratorium leads the individual into becoming something else. What distinguishes an adolescent in moratorium from the identity-diffused individual is "the appearance of an active struggle to make commitments" (Marcia, 1966, p. 552).
4. Identity achievement: "The hiatus of development is thought to be found in the *identity achievement* status youth" (Adams, et al., 1990, p. 10). This level is noted for an individual's high commitment and high exploration. Therefore, an individual in this stage possesses "an autonomous resolution of identity, incorporating a set of commitments adopted during a period of exploration (moratorium)" (Patterson, Sochting, & Marcia, 1992, p. 12). Simply, adolescents who "commit to various ideologies and behavioral styles following an active period of exploration (crisis) are viewed as identity achievers" (Jones, 1992, p. 220). Like those in the

moratorium stage, individuals in the achievement stage possess a high level of moral reasoning. Moreover, they do not live for the moment, but have a future oriented perspective. As adolescents, these individuals tend to make high grades in school, are self-confident and emotionally mature and are reflective and analytical. Overall, individuals who are *achieved* think for themselves and direct their lives accordingly. They have engaged in “a search process, [have experienced an identity crisis, and [have] resolved it through self-selected personal commitments that reflect a self-definition” (Adams et al., 1990, p. 10).

#### Generativity vs Self-absorption

According to Erikson, once a husband and wife have established some measure of intimacy their interests begin to expand beyond *couplehood*. Usually, the couple becomes concerned with raising the next generation; subsequently, they enter a stage of Generativity verses self-absorption and stagnation (Erikson, 1963). Generativity, caring for and contributing to the next generation (Erikson, 1963), is the term Erikson used to describe the primary task of adulthood (Snarey, 1997).

Based on Erikson’s model (1963), besides assisting in conceiving children, men should also nurture, protect, and guide their offspring. In order to fulfill such a responsibility, fathers should overcome the temptation of self-absorption and stagnation. Instead, they must make sacrifices for the next generation. Thus, “[t]o the extent that they can positively cope with this conflict, they develop their ability to *care* for the next generation (Crain, 1992, p. 259).

Therefore, Erikson's model is a useful tool in examining the father-son dyad. The model provides both explanatory and predictive power in analyzing identity and pubertal relationships. The model, also, is practical and provides insight to the reciprocal effect that exists in the father-son relationship. For instance, it is a possible notion that while the son is encountering puberty, the father could be experiencing mid-life difficulties of his own (MacDermid & Crouter, 1995). Thus identity must be examined from both sides of the issue, and Erikson's model provides a framework for such an examination.

#### Father and Son Identity

More often than not, the rapid changes that occur during puberty can affect the way male adolescents feel about themselves. During the course of puberty, there are many different concerns to process. For instance, both males who mature early and those who mature late have body image issues to deal with. Males who mature early may be expected to act like adults when they are 15, while those who are late in maturing are often unable to participate in sports or other socially acceptable activities.

Identity has been examined from various perspectives, the most salient being Berzonsky's identity styles and Marcia's identity statuses. Marcia's notion of identity status "has become a popular working model for many developmental researchers interested in adolescence and young adulthood" (White & Jones, 1996, p. 491).

According to Erikson (1963), the successful navigation through adolescence was predicated upon the effective completion of the first four stages: trust versus mistrust, autonomy vs shame and doubt, initiative versus guilt, and industry versus inferiority.

During the fifth stage, identity versus role confusion, adolescents try to discover who they are and who they can become. The goal of this stage is to achieve a sense of personal identity with respect to future profession, political views, religious beliefs, and other values (White & Jones, 1996). "Although Erikson does not discuss it this way, identity can be conceptualized as a self-constructed theory of the self" (Berzonsky, 1992, p. 193). The adolescents major focus is to discover a lifestyle to which they can make a permanent commitment to their beliefs (Crain, 1992). Erikson (1963) argued that those who have not resolved conflicts in the previous stages would have difficulty resolving identity issues.

Marcia's contribution to measuring identity statuses was operationalizing the variables, thus placing individuals into one of four status categories based on degrees of exploration and commitment: diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, and identity achievement (Berzonsky, 1992). Each of the four styles represents a specific style of coping with decisions, solving problems, and negotiating identity issues (Berzonsky, 1992).

Berzonsky argued that identity development is characterized by three distinct styles. "Each style reflects a mutually exclusive means of problem solving, decision making, and coping. The identity styles mediate behavioral and cognitive approaches used in decision making" (White & Jones, 1996, p. 492). Berzonsky explained that *identity styles* and *identity statuses* are similar, yet disparate in several key areas:

Self-explorers, Moratoriums and Achievers, are *information oriented*; they actively seek out, elaborate, and evaluate relevant information before making decisions and committing themselves. The major difference between them is whether the

decision-making process is ongoing or completed. Foreclosures are more *norm oriented*. They focus on the normative expectations held for them by significant referent others, parental figures being an example. Uncommitted Diffusions tend to delay and procrastinate until the hedonic cues in the immediate situation dictate a course of behavior. Their *diffuse orientation* involves attempts to avoid confronting problems as long as possible" (Berzonsky, 1990, p. 161).

Therefore, identity styles refer "to the strategy that an individual characteristically uses, or, reportedly, would prefer to deploy (Berzonsky, 1992, p. 196). "By late adolescence, most individuals have attained the cognitive complexity to use each of the three identity styles, but one style is typically preferred over the others" (White & Jones, 1996, p. 492).

### Summary

As young men begin the pubertal process, they experience significant developmental changes, both physically and emotionally. It appears that such changes propel the young man into an identity crisis - he is no longer sure whom he is, or what he is about. Even if the adolescent male has previously been close to his father, during puberty he will usually turn to his peer group for support and acceptance, thus generating some distance between he and his father.

There are other problems, however, besides the son's own adolescent development that contribute to father-son distancing. At this juncture, many fathers are dealing with the nagging questions of mid-life reassessment or the pressures of establishing themselves



in a career. Like their adolescent sons, many fathers experience self-doubt and identity issues as well. For example, during this time of introspection a father could ask himself questions such as, "Who am I?" and "What have I accomplished?" Often, such inquiries and circumstances can lead to personal introspection.

During this critical time period of both adolescent and adult development, fathers and sons tend to separate from each other. However, at this stage of life fathers need to be admired and needed by their sons, while sons need independence from their fathers' and families. From this standpoint, it appears that some degree of conflict is inevitable.

Erikson's theory of psychosocial development is useful in addressing father and son involvement during puberty because it addresses the psychosocial context of both the father and the son as well as the concept of identity. Moreover, Erikson's theory deals with the needs of each party, as well as the ego strength's necessary to negotiate such conflicts.

The research objectives of this study are:

1. To determine if there is a relationship between adolescent male physical development and identity development.
2. To determine if male adolescent physical development mediates the paternal (father)/male-adolescent (son) relationship. Does puberty influence paternal/adolescent distancing and involvement?
3. To determine if there is a relationship between psychosocial development and identity development.

4. To determine if the relationship between paternal/male adolescent psychosocial development mediates father/son involvement.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS

To commence this study, subjects will be defined, the design will be discussed, and ethical considerations will be mentioned. Moreover, measurement instruments will be presented, as well as data collection procedures, and the process whereby the data will be reduced and transformed.

#### Subjects

This study employed a *purposive* sample, which indicates that respondents were selected "because they are thought by the researcher to be representative of the larger population being studied" (Miller, 1986, p. 72). Hence, respondents were deliberately chosen because of their characteristics. In this case, respondents included adolescent males from three different pubertal statuses: pre, trans and post. Therefore, respondents were recruited from local middle schools, high schools, alternative schools, and scout troops.

Specifically, sons from the following institutions, along with their fathers, participated in this study: Preston High School, Westside High School, Soda Springs High School, Tigert Middle School, Marsh Valley Middle School, and Grace High School. Furthermore, students from the Weber Valley Detention Center also participated, as well as boy scouts and their fathers from troops in Logan, West Jordan, and Riverton, Utah.

Teachers, principals and scout leaders administered the questionnaires. Initially, young men at each location were invited to participate in the study and those who agreed

to take part were given a packet to take home. Packet contents included an “Informed Consent” form (Appendix A), a “Son’s Version” of the survey (Appendix B), a “Father’s Version” of the survey (Appendix C), and two candy bars for incentives. The young men were instructed by their teachers and leaders to take the survey home, and then, with their fathers, read through and sign the informed consent form if they agreed to the conditions and were willing to participate.

Once the consent forms were signed, fathers and sons were to complete the surveys independent of each other; fathers and sons were instructed not to complete the surveys together. The completed surveys were then placed back in the packets by the young men, and finally, returned to their teacher or leader. Table 1 lists each location where the surveys were administered and the response rates. Ultimately, 413 sets of surveys were distributed to young men in various locations, and 173 sets were completed and returned, for an overall response rate of 42 percent.

Table 1

Response Rates of Each Location Surveyed

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Rate of Return</u>		
	<u>Surveys Distributed</u>	<u>Surveys Returned</u>	<u>Rate</u>
Tigert Middle School	60	10	17%
Soda Springs High School	35	14	40%
West Side High School	30	11	37%
Preston High School	65	20	31%
Marsh Valley Middle School	35	25	71%
Grace High School	60	14	23%
Weber Valley Detention Ctr.	25	24	96%
Scout Troop 1 (Logan)	30	2	07%
Scout Troop 1007 (W. Jordan)	25	17	68%
Scout Troop ???? (Cache Valley)	19	18	95%
Scout Troop 219 (Cache Valley)	9	5	56%
Scout Troop 330 (Cache Valley)	10	7	70%
Scout Troop 3694 (Riverton)	10	6	60%
Total	413	173	42%

Sample characteristics of young men who participated in the study included that 48% were from the 8th and 10th grades, and the median age reported was 15.54. In fact, 6% of the sample were 6th graders; 11.4% were 7th graders; 24.6% were 8th graders; 6.6% were 9th graders; 23.4% were 10th graders; 13.2% were 11th graders; and 15% were 12th graders. Moreover, 78% of the young men came from households with 5 people or more, and 70.6% of these adolescent participants reported that they reside among intact families; 11.4% from stepfamilies, and 10.2% from single-parent families.

Further, 77.8% of the young men reported their religious affiliation with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 7.2% affiliated with the Catholic faith, 7.2% claimed no faith or denomination, 6.6% associated with other religions other than Catholic or Latter-day Saint. Also, 70.6% of the young men reported attending church at least once a week. Finally, these young men reported spending on the average 3.16 hours per day and 24.19 hours per week with their fathers.

As for the fathers, the average age was 44.4, and the average number of school years completed was 14.36. As for economic factors, 8.5% of the fathers reported a yearly income of 0-\$20,000; 34.2% reported \$20-\$40,000; 27.4% reported \$40-\$60,000; 12% reported \$60-\$80,000; 6% reported \$80-\$100,000; and 6% reported an annual salary of more than \$100,000.

Pertaining to education, 31% of the fathers had at least a High School diploma while 14.7% graduated from a four-year college; 11.2% attained Master's degrees and 7.7% went beyond a Master's degree. Moreover, 86.3% of the fathers reported residing in an intact family while 7.7% were part of stepfamilies, and 1.8% were involved in single-parent families. It should also be noted that 81.3% of the fathers lived in households with at least five members or more; 60.5% had 3 or more sons and 23.2% had 3 or more daughters. Regarding religion, 49.1% of the fathers reported attending church activities more than once a week, and 82.9% claimed affiliation with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Finally, these fathers reported that on the average, they spend at least 2.56 hours per day and 21.71 hours per week with their sons.

### Design

The main independent variable, pubertal status, can be considered in three stages: pre-puberty, trans-puberty, and post-puberty. The dependent variables include father/son involvement and psychosocial status. Miller (1986) argues that there are two major considerations when selecting a research design: fit and efficiency. Regarding “fit,” the research design selected should fit the problem being studied. Hence, there are many designs that could be used; however, the design selected should be based on the specific research questions (Miller, 1986).

“Efficiency” suggests that when designing a study, time, money, skill required, and other resources should be considered (Miller, 1986). Ideally, a longitudinal study would be preferred. Unfortunately, there was not adequate time or money to sustain such an undertaking. Therefore, the “non-equivalent groups” design was selected because it would both “fit” the research questions and be “efficient.”

The non-equivalent groups’ design is a cross-sectional method for data collection. In a cross-sectional design, instruments are administered one time only (Dooley, 1995); however, data are collected from groups of different ages, or as is the case with this study, groups in different stages of physical development. For instance, this study focuses on how father-son involvement changes during puberty (basically, between grades 6<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup>). Using the cross-sectional approach, students were recruited at three stages: pre, trans (during), and post puberty. Once the sample was identified, subjects were administered a survey at the same time or within a narrow range of dates. With the cross-

sectional design, the data collection period was short, thus eliminating the threat of attrition (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).

One type of cross-sectional research is the non-equivalent groups design. In this design research participants are not randomly assigned to groups. The notion of non-equivalency assumes that “if the same nonrandom selection process were repeated over and over again, the ...groups would differ in a number of ways” (Cook & Campbell, 1979, p. 148). For instance, in this study with a pre, trans, and post-puberty group, each group would undoubtedly exhibit a different pubertal status and would certainly “have different expected mean levels on a wide range of other characteristics related to [pubertal status]” (Cook & Campbell, 1979, p. 148). Therefore, the term non-equivalent implies that the “*expected* values of at least one characteristic of the groups are not equal” (Cook & Campbell, 1979, p. 148).

The non-equivalent groups design appears as follows:

Pre-pubertal	0	
Trans-pubertal	0	
Post-pubertal		0

As is the case with every research design, threats to internal validity exist. Internal validity refers to “the extent to which extraneous variables have been controlled by the researcher, so that any observed effects can be attributed solely to the treatment variable” (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, p. 761). Because a control group was not employed, nor were there pre and posttests, there were minimal threats to internal validity. The largest threat



to the non-equivalent groups' design is a cohort effect. A cohort is a subpopulation usually defined by birth year. A cohort effect "equals the difference between cohorts measured at the same age" (Dooley, 1995, p. 127). For example, a portion of this study was devoted to determining the psychosocial statuses of a cross-section of pre, trans, and post-pubertal young men. The ages of the young men in this study ranged between 10 and 18. Differences that can be determined among identity status between 11 year olds and 17 year olds might be partially explained due to age-specific development in addition to age or physical development. In fact, not only do these male adolescents belong to different birth cohorts, but they also "grew up in somewhat different social eras and therefore have had different experiences. In other words, this cross-sectional design confounds age and cohort" (Dooley, 1995, p. 127). Therefore, because young men of different cohorts were compared, the limitations of this methodology are acknowledged.

Finally, external validity should be mentioned. External validity refers to "the extent to which the results of a research study can be generalized to individuals and situations beyond those involved in the study" (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, p. 759). The findings in this study cannot be generalized to the general population because the sample was not random. The purpose of this project, however, was not to generalize; follow-up research can be conducted to determine generalizability. The objective of this project was to determine relationships between father and son psychosocial status, pubertal status, and involvement.

### Ethical Considerations

The protection of subjects is crucial to any study; hence, it would be unethical to proceed with a study without considering the protection of the subjects. Specifically, "Researchers must inform each individual about what will occur during the research study, the information to be disclosed to the researchers, and the intended use of the research data that are to be collected" (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, p. 88). Since minors were surveyed, consent to proceed with the study was granted by the parents. Further, consent was also obtained from appropriate school personnel because some of the research was conducted within the school system. Finally, the young men themselves signed the consent form to demonstrate their willingness to participate.

Since human subjects were certainly being studied, this particular project had to be approved first by the *Institutional Review Board* (IRB). One of the primary purposes of the IRB is to protect the rights of the participants in a study. Therefore, subjects were asked to complete the *Informed Consent* form for their own protection (See Appendix A). The *Informed Consent* form explained the procedures of the study, expressed the risks (if any), sought permission from the subjects and their parents and ensured confidentiality.

### Measurement

There were three constructs measured in this study: (1) Pubertal Status, (2) father involvement, and (3) psychosocial status. Moreover, both adolescent and paternal perceptions were assessed on each construct; therefore, each construct was measured in two ways: from both the father and son's viewpoint.

### *Peterson Pubertal Development Scale*

Pubertal status is a difficult construct to measure due to individual differences and patterns of pubertal development, lack of precise measurement techniques and problems with obtaining permission to use the most accurate measures available (Peterson, Crockett, Richards, & Boxer, 1988). Moreover, endocrine changes, those changes involving hormones, can only be appropriately measured with the help of medical technology. Somatic changes, changes of the external body, can be more readily noticed and accessed; however, measurement techniques have often been questioned (Peterson et al., 1988). For example, previous attempts to measure somatic development have focused on viewing pictures of individuals in different pubertal stages and circling the most appropriate description of one's own pubertal status. However, school superintendents, teachers and parents have frowned on such an "open" approach (Peterson et al., 1988).

Self-report measures appear to be the least controversial and most practical when measuring somatic pubertal changes. The *Peterson Development Scale* (PDS) has been useful in determining whether the adolescent is in pre, trans, or post puberty. This measure is brief and concise. There are five statements that access the progress of specific physical changes: body hair, voice change, growth spurt, facial hair and skin changes. Answer options on a Likert-scale include "not yet," "barely begun," "definitely underway," and "completed" (MacDermid & Crouter, 1995).

Reliability has been evaluated in terms of coefficient alpha (Peterson et al., 1988). Alpha coefficients range from .68 to .83, with a median of .77, suggesting internal

consistency among the test items. Peterson and colleagues have argued that "These are quite respectable alphas, especially since each is based on only five items" (Peterson et al., 1988, p. 123). With such alphas, it appears that these adolescents were consistent in their responses to pubertal change across characteristics (Peterson et al., 1988).

During the pubertal process, somatic changes increase over time. That is, a young man, over time, will acquire more hair, a thicker beard, and grow taller. Therefore, another appropriate measure of reliability is regression. For example, in the Peterson study, participants were surveyed twice a year. In the natural order of things, it would be rare for a young man in the Spring of 6th grade to circle a *three* on "body hair," and then in the Fall of 8th grade, to circle a *one* on the same characteristic. Therefore, statisticians have examined regression as a form of reliability, and the results have been consistent with other studies. Once again, the PDS has proved to be a consistent measure of pubertal status and development (Peterson et al., 1988).

Recent attempts to establish validity on the PDS have been somewhat successful. "A recent report ....finds high correlations between a questionnaire version of the PDS and physician ratings ( $r = .61 - .67$ ). The correlations between SMS self-ratings and the PDS were even higher ( $r = .72 - .80$ )" (Peterson et al., 1988, p. 126). Overall, the PDS appears to be a reliable and valid instrument; when compared to more objective or controversial assessments, the results are similar. Therefore, it became the preferred instrument for measuring pubertal status.

### *Father Involvement*

#### **Son's Perception**

First, it was necessary to appraise the construct of father involvement from the son's perspective. Lamb has argued that there are three dimensions of father involvement: (1) interaction, (2) accessibility, and (3) responsibility (1986; as cited in Doherty et al., 1998). There is an instrument that is multifaceted and sensitive to the distinctive dimensions of father involvement. The instrument, the *Parental Support Inventory* (PSI) is a twenty-item Likert-scale survey (Barber & Thomas, 1986). The measure is designed to be primarily used with children and adolescents.

Sample items include:

- (1) Whenever I had any kind of problem I could count on my father to help me out.
- (2) My father hugs and kisses me often.
- (3) My father shares many activities with me.

A factor analysis revealed four primary paternal factors or subscales: physical affection, general support, companionship and sustained contact. Cronbach's alpha for these factors is reported to range from .85 to .91. Barber and Thomas (1986), in their factor analysis of the *PSI*, reported factor loadings ranging from .65 to .85 on paternal physical affection; .66 to .80 on the general support factors; .60 to .80 on the companionship factors; and the sustained contact factors ranged from .74 to .84. Alpha reliability for each subscale was reported as follows: Physical affection, .91; General

Support, .91; Companionship, .86; and Sustained Contact, .85. Each of these variables or subscales is useful in accessing the multifaceted construct of father and son involvement. Moreover, the strong reliability renders the *PSI* adequate for the purpose of this study.

#### **Father's Perception**

Secondly, father and son involvement was also evaluated from the fathers' perspective. If a different measure were selected to measure involvement from a father's viewpoint, then it would be difficult to compare the responses between the father and sons. Therefore, the son's version of the *PSI* was adapted for measuring paternal perceptions as well. Sample items on the adapted *PSI* for fathers include:

- (1) Whenever my son has a problem, he can count on me to help him out.
- (2) I hug and kiss my son often.
- (3) I share many activities with my son.

By using the same instrument for both fathers and sons, the comparison between perceptions was more useful. There is a tendency for parents to rate themselves high, or to report that they are more successful than their teenage children perceive them (Acock & Bengtson, 1980; see also Paulson & Sputa, 1996). Hence, there was an expected discrepancy between the father's perception of his involvement and his son's perception (see chapter IV). Since this measure was adapted for fathers, there are no validity or reliability coefficients to report. Such coefficients are reported in Chapter IV.

## *Psychosocial Status*

### **Son's Perception**

Like father involvement, psychosocial status was examined from both father and son perceptions. For sons, the *Extended Version of the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status* (EOM-EIS) was the preferred measure of psychosocial status (Jones, Akers, White, 1994). This 64 item survey also utilizes a Likert-scale that ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Furthermore, the *EOM-EIS* is inexpensive, easy to administer and uncomplicated to score (Jones, Akers, & White, 1994). The *EOM-EIS* covers eight domains, which include occupation, religion, politics, friendships, dating, sex roles, philosophical style and recreation. In each domain, two items address one of the Marcia's four identity statuses: Achievement, Moratorium, Foreclosure, and Diffusion (Adams & Grotevant, 1984).

Sample items from the EOM-EIS include the following:

- (1) My parents know what's best for me in terms of how to choose friends.
- (2) After a lot of self-examination, I have established a very definite view on what my own lifestyle will be.
- (3) Some of my friends are very different from each other. I'm trying to figure out exactly where I fit in.

In addition, there are three broad scales: (1) Ideology, which includes occupation, religion, politics, and philosophy of life; (2) Interpersonal, which entails friendships, dating, sex roles, and recreation; and (3) Total Identity, which is a summation of ideology

and interpersonal scales. Moreover, Jones and colleagues have explained:

The *EOM-EIS* yields a score for each of four identity “statuses” (viz., achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusion) across two broad domains (ideological and interpersonal). In addition, when ideological and interpersonal scores are summed for each “status,” total scores reflect global assessments of achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusion (1994, p. 539).

The *EOM-EIS* was originally designed and validated based on responses from college students (Grotevant & Adams, 1984; see also Jones & Streitmatter, 1987). Internal consistency coefficients among Utah college students range between .37 to .77. On the Total Identity Scale, internal consistency coefficients among Utah college students range from .42 to .82. Moreover, split-half reliability in the Utah sample ranges from .10 to .68 on the Ideology and Interpersonal subscales and from .37 to .64 on the Total Identity scales. The reason some of these coefficients are so low (.10) can be attributed to the fact that college students were completing an exam designed for high school students. Therefore, some of the test items did not apply to them, and subsequently were not answered or answered inconsistently. For example, the question “My parents know what’s best for me in terms of how to choose friends” does not really apply to a sophomore in college. Nevertheless, test-retest correlations for Ideology and Interpersonal Scales over a four-week period ranged from .59 to .82; Total Identity Scales varied from .63 to .83.

Validity has also been examined. Pertaining to content validity, the overall mean



percentage agreement for ten raters on 64 items was 96.5 percent. Factorial validity measures also demonstrated high correlations. For instance, the Ideology and Interpersonal scales correlated highly with the total scales ( $r$ 's between .78 and .92). However, the Ideology and Interpersonal Scales report only moderate correlations among Texas and Utah college students. Following is the breakdown:

	<u>Texas</u>	<u>Utah</u>
Achievement	.38	.37
Moratorium	.46	.51
Foreclosure	.68	.63
Diffusion	.46	.47

The EOM-EIS is useful in gauging ego identity among college students. Reliability estimates are acceptable, and evidence also exists for content, construct, discriminant, and concurrent validity. Moreover, a factor analysis revealed theoretically consistent factor structures (Adams & Grotevant, 1984).

Jones and Streitmatter (1987) examined EOM-EIS reliability and validity among early and middle adolescents. Regarding the internal consistency of the test, the following was determined:

<u>Subscale:</u>	<u>Cronbach's Alpha:</u>
Diffusion	.52
Foreclosure	.80
Moratorium	.74
Achievement	.77
<hr/>	
Median Coefficient = .67	

For the early and middle-adolescent groups, convergent validity estimates for all ideology and interpersonal identity subscales were found to be statistically significant. Moreover, results from four separate studies generated convincing evidence that the identity status subscales possessed convergent validity when compared to other constructs on similar measures such as self-acceptance, locus of control, rigidity and authoritarianism. Also, adequate concurrent validity measures were obtained by comparing the *EOM-EIS* with Marcia's Ego Identity Incomplete Sentence Blank (Jones & Streitmatter, 1987). "The results from the analysis ...are indicative of the appropriateness of all measures for early/middle adolescent samples" (Jones & Streitmatter, 1987, p. 654). Moreover, each of the *EOM-EIS* scales appear to be appropriate for early to middle adolescents and appear to be consistent with the theoretical constructs generated (Jones & Streitmatter, 1987). Therefore, the *EOM-EIS* remains an excellent instrument of choice in measuring adolescent identity.

#### **Father's Perception**

In order to measure the father's own identity status, Berzonsky's Identity Style

Inventory (Berzonsky, 1992) was used. The *ISI* was constructed by uncoupling the commitment and self-exploration components employed to operationally define identity status (Berzonsky, 1992). "These styles focus on one aspect of Marcia's 1966 identity statuses: different ways in which individuals approach or manage to avoid the task of identity exploration" (Berzonsky, 1992, p. 774). The inventory is more helpful than other measures in classifying individuals (Jones, Akers, & White, 1994) and specifically assesses the developmental processes utilized in coping and problem solving.

Initially, subjects were asked to rate on a 7-point Likert scale the extent to which the statements were "like" them or "not like" them (Berzonsky, 1989). Sample statements include the following:

- (1) I've spent a great deal of time thinking seriously about what I should do with my life.
- (2) I'm not sure which values I really hold.
- (3) I find it best to seek out advice from professionals when I have problems.

There are three subscales and identity styles that the instrument helps in identifying: information oriented, diffuse, and normative. Individuals who are information oriented tend to view problems as manageable and solvable. They seek out relevant information, evaluate options, and then solve their problem. Diffused individuals usually procrastinate and avoid making decisions. Moreover, they tend to reduce, deny or escape from stress. Finally, those categorized in the normative style have a tendency to turn to authorities and significant others for advice and direction. These individuals are more

concerned with whom they ask rather than the quality of the information provided (Berzonsky, 1992).

The three subscales (information oriented, diffused, and normative) yield adequate estimates of test-retest reliability and moderate estimates of internal reliability (Berzonsky, 1992). Internal consistency of the scales was determined by administering the inventory to 155 college students. Reliability coefficients were tested and reported as follows (Berzonsky, 1990):

<u>Subscale</u>	<u>Alpha</u>	<u>Test-Retest Comparison's (5 + Weeks)</u>
Diffuse	.73	.78
Normative	.66	.78
Information	.62	.86

The *ISI* also has evidence of construct validity through convergent relations with Grotevant and Adams (1984) Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status which employs the four identity statuses identified by Marcia: Achieved, moratorium, foreclosure, and diffused. Correlations between the subscales of the two instruments was reported by Berzonsky (1989): Diffuse (*ISI*) and Diffusion (*OM-EIS*),  $r = .62$ ; Normative (*ISI*) and Foreclosure (*OM-EIS*),  $r = .47$ ; Information (*ISI*) and Achieved (*OM-EIS*),  $r = .25$  are listed below:

It appears from the information presented that the *ISI* is a reliable and useful instrument. Moreover, the measure was helpful in comparing father psychosocial status to son psychosocial status.

### Data Collection Procedures

Data collection proceeded as follows:

1. In March of 1999, this study commenced. Since human subjects were examined, the *Institutional Review Board* (IRB) received this proposal for review and approval. Endorsement was given to proceed with the study in April of 1999.
2. The Superintendents of Cache County, Logan and Sandy were contacted in March of 1999. Because the State of Utah has a privacy act regarding data collection in schools, only one district, Cache, committed to participate in the study. However, their proposed methodology (obtaining a mailing list and then mailing the surveys home) was not a viable option because of the typically low response rate (Miller, 1986). Therefore, Southeastern Idaho School Superintendents were contacted in early April of 1999. Permission to proceed with the study was granted in the following Districts: Preston, Westside, Soda Springs, Grace and Marsh Valley.
3. Once permission was given, Principals of the approved schools were contacted and a day was selected to pass out the survey packets. Many of the principals appointed a teacher to supervise the study. The student researcher informed the principals and supervising teachers that all surveys would be collected at the end of a week. Follow-up calls and letters were sent to remind the staff of the survey pick-up time. Most schools needed two weeks to collect an adequate number of surveys. Besides the candy bars located in the packet, many teachers gave their students who participated extra credit as an incentive to participate.

4. By the end of May, it became obvious that the return rate in the school districts was very poor (32 %), as the school year rapidly came to a close. Efforts to gain permission to conduct the study in other school districts proved to be futile. Therefore, other avenues of data collection were pursued. The Weber Valley Detention Center and Scout Troops in Cache Valley, Riverton, and West Jordan were asked to participate and several agreed. The response rate from members of these organizations was exactly twice the rate as the participating school districts (64%).
5. By June 30, all data had been collected and entered into the computer.

#### Data Reduction and Transformation

The goal of this study was to collect 200 completed sets of instruments. Instead, about 190 were collected in a three month period. Once the questionnaires were examined and the incomplete ones discarded, data entry and subsequent analysis commenced. The data (173 cases) were entered on the SPSS database, Version 8.0.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

Following the procedures detailed in Chapter III, a statistical analysis was performed on the data in order to determine possible relationships between pubertal status, psychosocial status and paternal involvement among adolescent males. The results from this analysis are reported in this section. Initially, the reliability and validity of the measures are addressed, and then the results for each specific hypothesis are discussed.

#### Reliability and Validity

##### *Pubertal Status*

The *Peterson Development Scale* (PDS) was the instrument used to assess pubertal status. Cronbach alpha coefficients were computed to determine the internal consistency of the measure. For the young men who reported their own pubertal status, the five-item measure yielded an alpha coefficient of .85 ( $N = 165$ ); for the fathers who were rating their son's pubertal status, the measure generated an alpha coefficient of .91 ( $N = 120$ ). These estimates compare favorably with previous estimates of internal consistency reported by Peterson and associates (1988). In fact, after a three-year study of the *PDS* (which included two measurement periods per year), the Peterson team reported Cronbach alpha coefficients ranging from .68 to .83, with a median of .77. They concluded that "These are quite respectable alphas, especially since each is based on only five items" (Peterson et al., 1988, p. 123). It appears that the young men and fathers who answered the questions on the *PDS* were consistent in their responses to pubertal change

across the physical characteristics of body hair, voice change, skin change, growth spurt and facial hair.

Calculating Pearson correlations between items on the *PDS* generated discriminant /convergent validity coefficients. A discriminant/convergent validity analysis on the son's self-reporting of his own pubertal status and the father's reporting of his son's pubertal status revealed the intercorrelations presented in Table 2. Note that there were 165 son surveys and 115 father surveys that were acceptable and could be used in this analysis.

Table 2

Discriminant/Convergent Validity: Father and Son Pubertal Status Intercorrelations

Status	Pubertal Trait				
	Body Hair	Voice Change	Skin Change	Growth Spurt	Facial Hair
Body Hair	<b>.47</b>	.77	.73	.61	.75
Voice Change	.56	<b>.70</b>	.74	.62	.70
Skin Change	.57	.75	<b>.56</b>	.63	.67
Growth Spurt	.36	.55	.52	<b>.38</b>	.68
Facial Hair	.48	.53	.59	.38	<b>.57</b>

Note. Father coefficients are reported above the diagonal; son coefficients are reported below. Bolded coefficients represent correlation between father and son responses on the same items. N = 165 sons; N = 115 fathers.

Regarding the son's reporting on the *PDS*, the mean inter-item correlation was .53. This correlation coefficient suggests not only a moderate correlation between items,



but also that 28 percent of the variability between the items, on average, is shared by the other test items. These statistics provide adequate evidence for construct validity on the measure. Moreover, every survey item is positively correlated with each other, suggesting that, for example, as a young man's score on "body hair" increased, so did his score on "voice change." Note that the association between a young man's growth spurt and body hair was not as strong as the association between skin change (i.e., acne) and voice change. The alpha of .85 provides evidence that the five items on the *PDS* are consistently measuring various aspects of the physical changes that accompany puberty.

For the fathers' version of the *PDS*, the mean inter-item correlation of .69 provides ample evidence of item overlap within the measure. This correlation coefficient suggests not only a strong correlation between test items, but also that on average, 48 percent of the variability between the items is shared by the other test items. The intercorrelations tend to be relatively large, which should not be surprising considering the fact that pubertal attributes such as body hair, growth spurt and voice change are likely to share common variance. For example, from the father's responses a Pearson  $r$  correlation of .77 was generated between "voice change" and "body hair," suggesting similarity between items (59 percent shared variance).

Paired sample correlations between the fathers and sons' responses on each of the five items from the *PDS* provide evidence that fathers and sons are in agreement on the sons' pubertal status. In fact, the overall correlation between the two measures generated a Pearson  $r$  of .68 which is similar to the findings reported in the original Peterson (1988)

study when the *PDS* was compared to other tests which measured similar constructs ( $r = .61$  to  $r = .80$ ). Furthermore, it appears that fathers and sons seem to more readily agree on the obtrusive indicators of puberty such as voice change and facial hair; whereas, on the unobtrusive indicators of puberty such as body hair (a more private issue), the correlations are not as strong. Such a tendency is expected and reflects cultural inhibitions on male privacy and the fact that sons may exaggerate their responses.

#### *Father Involvement*

The *Parental Support Inventory* (PSI) was modified and used for both fathers and sons. The sons were instructed to rate their fathers, and fathers were instructed to rate themselves in the following areas: general support, physical affection, companionship and sustained contact. Cronbach's alpha was used to calculate reliability estimates. In their original work, Barber and Thomas (1986) reported the following alpha coefficients for the four scales: General Support, .91; Physical Affection, .91; Companionship, .86; and Sustained Contact, .85 ( $N = 527$ ). Table 3 displays PSI subscale reliability estimates obtained from fathers and sons from this study.

Table 3

PSI Subscale Reliabilities-Cronbach's Alpha: Fathers and sons

<u>Son's and Father's Reliability Coefficients</u>				
<u>Scale</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Son's</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Father's</u>
General Support	171	.91	121	.85
Physical Affection	171	.90	120	.90
Companionship	172	.89	119	.81
Sustained Contact	172	.73	115	.82

The estimates from the current study are similar to those reported in Barber and Thomas (1986) and suggest favorable levels of internal consistency. Prior to this study the *PSI* had never before been adapted for use by fathers, so the obtained reliability coefficients are encouraging.

In order to access construct validity among the *PSI* scales, inter-scale correlations were calculated for both the father and son responses. Results are reported in Table 4.

Table 4

Discriminant/Convergent Validity: PSI Subscale Interrelations Between Fathers and Sons

Scale	PSI Subscales			
	General Support	Physical Affection	Companionship	Sustained Contact
General Support	<b>.57</b>	.32	.54	.14
Physical Affection	.37	<b>.75</b>	.26	.66
Companionship	.78	.39	<b>.47</b>	.31
Sustained Contact	.33	.58	.41	<b>.39</b>

Note. Father coefficients are reported above the diagonal; son coefficients are reported below. Bolded coefficients (on the diagonal) represent the correlation between fathers and sons on the same items.  $N = 170$  sons;  $N = 115$  fathers.

Regarding the sons' responses, the correlation coefficients (Pearson's  $r$ ) between the four subscales are all positive and provide evidence of construct validity for the measure. For instance, correlation coefficients ranged from .33 to .78, with a mean inter-scale correlation of .47. This correlation coefficient suggests not only a moderate correlation between the four scales, but also that 22 percent of the variability between the scales is shared by the other scales. A Pearson  $r$  correlation for the son's rating of general support and companionship yielded a coefficient of .78. This is a relatively high correlation, suggesting that for the sons, general support and companionship are related variables. As scoring on general support increased, so did scoring on companionship. Moreover, on average, these two scales share 61 percent of the variability, suggesting similarity between the items on the scales.

It should be noted that one additional item was added to the *PSI*. The item was designed to measure father-son satisfaction. The item simply read: "I am satisfied with my relationship with my father." Response choices included 1) never, 2) hardly ever, 3) sometimes, 4) fairly often, and 5) very often. This single test item yielded the highest correlation with the General Support Scale ( $r = .80$ ) and the lowest correlation with the Physical Affection Scale ( $r = .33$ ). Hence, general support and satisfaction are more closely related than satisfaction and physical affection.

For fathers, the correlation coefficients (Pearson's  $r$ ) among these subscales were all positive as well, although the correlations for the son's version of the *PSI* were somewhat stronger. For the fathers' responses, correlation coefficients ranged from  $r = .14$  to  $r = .66$ , with a mean inter-scale, correlation of  $r = .37$ .

Finally, paired sample correlations between Father and Son *PDS* scales and the satisfaction item provided evidence that there is agreement between fathers and sons on the four major subscales that assess father involvement. The sons' total scores on the *PSI* were correlated with the fathers' total scores for an overall positive association of  $r = .71$ . The scales of general support ( $r = .57$ ) and physical affection ( $r = .75$ ) generated the highest correlations while companionship ( $r = .47$ ) and sustained contact ( $r = .39$ ) yielded the lowest correlations. Therefore, it appears that fathers and sons seem to more readily agree on physical affection and general support (security in the relationship) than on companionship (time together) and sustained contact (sitting on lap; picking son up).

### *Identity Status*

The young men in the study completed the Extended Version of the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (*EOM-EIS*). The following alpha coefficient's were generated from the four major scales: 1) Diffusion, .76 ( $N = 140$ ), 2) foreclosure, .82 ( $N = 143$ ); 3) moratorium, .80 ( $N = 146$ ); and 4) achievement, .82 ( $N = 152$ ). These reliability estimates for the *EOM-EIS* identity scales compare favorably with the estimates reported by Jones and Streitmatter (1987), which included the following coefficients: 1) Diffusion, .52; 2) foreclosure, .80; 3) moratorium, .74; and 4) achievement, .77. Besides examining the *EOM-EIS* for internal consistency among the scales, alpha coefficients were also calculated (Table 5) to determine internal consistency among the *EOM-EIS* identity status level (IDL) subscales (total IDL and ideological/interpersonal IDL).

Table 5

#### EOM-EIS Subscale Reliabilities: Cronbach's Alpha

Scale	EOM-EIS Domains			
	N	Ideological	Interpersonal	Total
Achievement	166	.68	.78	.76
Moratorium	166	.84	.85	.88
Foreclosed	165	.69	.63	.69
Diffused	167	.76	.74	.78

These estimates also compare well with estimates of reliability reported by Adams, Bennion, and Huh (1987) and Jones and Streitmatter (1987). It appears that the *EOM-*

*EIS* demonstrated adequate internal consistency among scales and domains. Moreover, the measure has also behaved in this study as it has in the past in terms of reliability.

In order to access construct validity, intercorrelations between the subscales were also tabulated by using the Pearson  $r$  correlation coefficient. The purpose of this statistical analysis was to determine which subscales "converge" and which subscales "discriminate" or diverge. The results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

EOM-EIS Discriminant/Convergent Validity: Status Intercorrelations

Status	N	Achievement	Moratorium	Foreclosed	Diffused
Achievement	152	-	-	-	-
Moratorium	146	.53 (.28)	-	-	-
Foreclosed	143	.32 (.10)	.36 (.13)	-	-
Diffused	140	.40 (.16)	.78 (.61)	.35 (.12)	-

Note. Coefficients of Determination ( $r^2$ ) are located in parenthesis.

As expected, the subscales of achievement and moratorium demonstrated a stronger correlation than achievement with foreclosure or achievement with diffusion. For example, the strongest relationship observed was between the scales of moratorium and diffusion ( $r = .78$ ) which indicates a strong association between those two scales. On the other hand, the scale of achievement and foreclosure generated a Pearson  $r$  coefficient of .32, a moderate association.

When examining coefficients of determination, the values generated by Jones and

Streitmatter (1987) are similar to the values obtained in this study. For example, when comparing the scales of achievement and diffusion, Jones and Streitmatter (1987) reported a shared variance of .19; the shared variance in this study between the same two Subscales yielded a shared variance of .16. The achievement and diffusion scales measure different constructs, and these coefficients reflect that phenomenon.

On the other hand, there is also evidence of convergence for constructs that are theoretically related. For example, the scales of achievement and moratorium, similar concepts in many aspects, should provide coefficients that would tend to represent such similarity. Jones and Streitmatter (1987) reported a shared variance of .27 on these two scales; the shared variance in this study on the same two scales generated a shared variance of .28. These correlation coefficients and coefficients of determination provide evidence of construct validity and strongly compare with results from previous studies.

The measurement of choice for the father's identity status was the Identity Style Inventory (*ISI*). As with the other measures, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were computed to determine the internal consistency of the cognitive style subscales: 1) Information .80 ( $N = 119$ ); Normative .63 ( $N = 116$ ); and Diffuse/Avoidant .76 ( $N = 110$ ). These estimates are comparable to previous reliability reports using this measure (Berzonsky, 1990; Berzonsky & Sullivan, 1992; Jones et al., 1992; White & Jones, 1996).

Conceptually, the Information and Normative cognitive styles both include similar components of a strong commitment to lifestyle and values and belief. Therefore, a positive correlation should be expected between these scales. However, the Information



and the Diffuse/Avoidant scales should exhibit weaker correlations, and hence, less shared variance. This trend is expected because the Diffuse/Avoidant person would display a low level of commitment to a task. Furthermore, the Normative and Diffuse/Avoidant scores should also demonstrate a weaker relationship because those who score high on the normative scale display high levels of commitment, as evidenced in Table 7.

Table 7

ISI Discriminant/Convergent Validity: Identity Status Intercorrelations for Fathers

Status	N	Information	Diffuse	Normative
Information	119	-	-	-
Diffuse	110	-.12 (.01)	-	-
Normative	116	.67 (.45)	.00 (.00)	-

Note. Coefficients of Determination ( $r^2$ ) are located in parenthesis.

Note the relatively strong correlation between the information and normative scales ( $r = .67$ ). In fact, these two scales share 45 percent of the variability on the constructs measured, which provide evidence for convergence. However, there was a weak and negative correlation between the information and diffuse scales ( $r = -.12$ ) which only share 1 percent of the variance between the constructs. This coefficient provides evidence for discrimination or divergence between the scales of information and diffusion, and confirms that these scales are measuring different constructs. Finally, there was no relationship between the normative and diffusion scales.

From the data presented, each of the four measures, the *PDS*, *PSI*, *EOM-EIS*, and *ISI*, demonstrated adequate levels of reliability and validity for the purposes of this study. The next part of this chapter focuses on hypotheses testing and results.

### Hypotheses Testing

The purpose of the following hypotheses were to explore relationships between pubertal status, psychosocial status and father-son involvement. There were four major questions that directed the research. Each hypothesis is presented following the research question. After each hypothesis, the statistical information is presented.

#### *Puberty and Identity*

**Research Question #1:** Is there a relationship between male adolescent physical development and male adolescent psychosocial development?

Ho: There is no statistically significant relationship between pubertal status and psychosocial development.

The Peterson Development Scale (*PDS*) measured male adolescent physical development and psychosocial development was assessed using the Extended Version of the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (*EOM-EIS*). Identity status or psychosocial development was the dependent variable while the independent variable included three levels of pubertal status: pre, trans, and post. After examining the scores from the *PDS*, sons were categorized into one of these three groups according to their scores. Using the son's ratings, 30.6 percent of the sample scored between 1-12 on the *PDS* and were placed in the pre-pubertal group; 33.8 percent scored between 13-15 and were placed in

the trans-pubertal group; and 35.8 percent scored between 16-20 and were placed in the post-pubertal group.

Both father and son responses to the *PDS* were used in this analysis. Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, were tabulated to determine how the scoring on the *EOM-EIS* fared when compared to pubertal status. Table 8 provides means and standard deviations for psychosocial scale scores among the pre, trans, and post-pubertal groups.

Table 8

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Psychosocial Status

Psychosocial Status	Pubertal Status					
	Pre-pubertal		Trans-pubertal		Post-pubertal	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Achievement	67.08	12.08	64.48	14.88	64.56	12.74
Diffusion	55.90	12.44	52.33	12.88	52.22	12.00
Foreclosure	60.77	12.87	57.18	13.55	51.67	12.94
Moratorium	62.73	13.59	60.06	13.94	59.58	12.26

Note. N Achievement, 159; N Diffusion, 160; N Foreclosure, 158; N Moratorium, 159.

As shown in Table 8, there appears to be a general decrease in scoring for each scale as the young men move through puberty. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA's) were used to compare the means of the three pubertal groups across the four *EOM-EIS*

subscales: achieved, foreclosed, moratorium and diffused. Regarding the data on the sons, the results from the one-way ANOVA's provided evidence that there was a statistically significant difference between the means of the pre, trans, and post-pubertal groups on the identity status of foreclosure ( $p < .002$ ). There were no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the three pubertal groups on the other three scales. A source table for psychosocial status using the sons' estimate of puberty can be found in Appendix D.

Inasmuch as there was a statistically significant difference between the three pubertal groups on the foreclosed scale, an LSD post hoc analysis was performed to determine where the between group differences actually occurred. The analysis revealed that there was a statistically significant difference ( $p < .01$ ) between the pre and post-pubertal groups, there was also a statistically significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) between the trans and post-pubertal groups. The findings also suggested that the most profound decrease in foreclosure occurred between trans and post-puberty.

Fathers were also given the *PDS* and instructed to rank their sons' pubertal status. There was an overall paired sample correlation of .67 when item for item, both the fathers' and sons' version of the *PDS* were compared. Therefore, when running the ANOVA's using the same variables (independent: pubertal status; dependent: identity status), it was anticipated that father and son perceptions of pubertal status would relate in a similar way to the sons' psychosocial identity status. As expected, when the fathers rated the sons' pubertal status, there was still a statistically significant difference between the means of the

pre, trans and post-pubertal groups on the foreclosed scale ( $p < .01$ ). As with the sons' reporting, there were no statistically significant differences between the mean scores among the three groups on the scales of achievement, moratorium, and diffusion. A source table for psychosocial status using the fathers' estimate of puberty can be found in Appendix E.

An LSD post hoc test revealed the same patterns as the sons' post hoc comparisons. For example, there was a statistically significant difference on the foreclosure scale between pre and trans-pubertal groups ( $p < .05$ ). There was also a statistically significant difference between the pre and post-pubertal groups ( $p < .05$ ). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. When examining these variables from both the fathers and sons perspectives, there was a statistically significant relationship between pubertal status and the psychosocial identity status of foreclosure.

#### *Pubertal Status and Father Involvement*

**Research Question #2:** Is there a relationship between male adolescent pubertal status and father involvement?

Ho: There is no statistically significant relationship between pubertal status and father involvement.

In this case, the independent variable was pubertal status, and, as with the research question #1, the young men were divided into three groups: pre, trans, and post-pubertal. Once again, pubertal status was determined by the total score on the Peterson Development Scale (PDS). The dependent variable was father involvement. To assess

father involvement, both fathers and sons completed the Parental Support Inventory (*PSI*).

First of all, ANOVA's utilized the fathers' responses to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between the three pubertal groups among the *PSI* Subscales of general support, physical affection, companionship, and sustained contact.

Table 9 provides the means and standard deviations for *PSI* scores for each group as rated by the fathers.

Table 9

Pubertal Status (Fathers' Ratings) by Mean Scores for Father Involvement (Fathers' Ratings)

PSI Scale	Pubertal Status						
	Pre-pubertal			Trans-pubertal		Post-pubertal	
	N	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
GenSupport	114	27.00	4.04	25.10	4.25	26.53	3.23
PhyAffection	114	15.11	5.58	13.45	5.49	12.91	6.80
Compship	114	13.02	1.62	13.45	2.63	13.82	5.19
SusContact	114	8.32	3.36	7.55	3.63	7.58	5.12

The data in Table 9 indicate that from their fathers' perspectives, as sons increase in pubertal development, scores on the *PSI* generally decrease. Or in other words, as sons move through puberty, fathers perceive less involvement in the relationship. For instance, the scores on the physical affection scale demonstrated that the fathers in this study rated

themselves higher in terms of affection when their sons were pre-pubertal and lower when they were post-pubertal. On the other hand, general support (security in the relationship) and sustained contact (father picking son up; son sitting on father's lap) appeared to be weakest during the trans-pubertal stage while companionship (time together) appeared to be relatively strong during trans-puberty and highest after puberty is complete. General support was weakest during the apex of puberty, and companionship was restored during the post-pubertal stage.

The ANOVA's revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between the pre and post puberty groups on any of the subscales from the *PSI*. When examining the fathers' responses, the null hypothesis could not be rejected. There were no statistically significant relationships between male pubertal status and father involvement according to the fathers' ratings. A source table for pubertal status and father involvement using the fathers' perceptions can be found in Appendix F.

ANOVA's were also utilized on the sons' perceptions of their own pubertal status and on their perceptions of their fathers' involvement. Table 10 provides the means and standard deviations for *PSI* scores among the pre, trans and post-pubertal groups as rated by sons. The results are somewhat different from what the fathers reported on the same items.

Table 10

Pubertal Status (Sons' Ratings) by Mean Scores for Father Involvement (Sons' Ratings)

PSI Scale	Pubertal Status						
	Pre-pubertal			Trans-pubertal		Post-pubertal	
	N	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
GenSupport	160	24.86	5.53	26.56	6.57	23.02	6.21
PhyAffection	160	13.44	6.23	10.57	5.00	9.51	4.33
Compship	160	12.76	2.38	12.94	2.56	11.40	3.04
SusContact	160	6.16	3.06	5.66	2.87	4.71	2.48

The same trends noted on the fathers' ratings were also reported by their sons: as the adolescent male moves through puberty, he perceives less involvement with his father. On the physical affection scale, the sons in this study rated their fathers higher in terms of physical affection when they were pre-pubertal and lower when they were post-pubertal. Moreover, general support (security in the relationship) was weakest during the post-pubertal stage; yet, general support and companionship (time together) were relatively strong during trans-puberty.

ANOVA's were used to compare the sons' ratings of father involvement among the four subscales of the *PSI*: general support, physical affection, companionship, and sustained contact; and between the three pubertal groups. The results of the one-way ANOVA's indicated that there were statistically significant differences between the means



( $p < .01$ ) in each of the three pubertal groups across every subscale. Furthermore, the sustained contact scale and the satisfaction item were statistically significant at the .05 level. According to the sons, puberty impacts their relationship with their fathers. A source table for pubertal status and father involvement using the sons' perceptions can be found in Appendix G.

Since there were statistically significant differences between the groups among all of the scales of the *PSI*, an LSD post hoc analysis was used to determine where the differences occurred. The analysis revealed that there were statistically significant differences between the pre and trans-pubertal groups ( $p < .005$ ) on the factors of companionship, physical affection and sustained contact. There were also statistically significant differences between the trans and post-pubertal groups ( $p < .05$ ) on the factors of companionship and general support. Finally, there were statistically significant differences between the pre and trans-pubertal groups ( $p < .05$ ) on the factor of physical affection. Therefore, when the sons' ratings were used, the null hypothesis was rejected. There was a statistically significant relationship between the young mens' pubertal status and their perception of their fathers' involvement. Physical affection between father and son decreases as a young man ventures through puberty. Apparently, fathers and sons do not perceive *involvement* in the same way; moreover, fathers could be exaggerating their involvement while sons could be under-reporting.

Since fathers and sons do not perceive events similarly, fathers' and sons' ratings were also compared on the *PSI*. Table 11 presents the differences between the mean

scores ( $\bar{D}$ ). Note that the greatest differences occurred among the post-pubertal group.

Table 11

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Father Involvement : Differences between Father and Son Mean Scores Responses.

PSI Scale	Pubertal Status		
	Pre-pubertal	Trans-pubertal	Post-pubertal
	$\bar{D}$	$\bar{D}$	$\bar{D}$
GenSupport	2.14	-1.46	3.51
PhyAffection	1.67	2.88	3.40
Compship	0.26	0.51	2.42
SusContact	2.16	1.89	2.87
Total	6.23	3.82	12.2

Note. Father mean score - son mean score =  $\bar{D}$ . N = 114 fathers; 160 sons.

In every case but one, fathers reported a higher score than their sons on the subscales of general support, physical affection, companionship, and sustained contact. The largest discrepancies occurred on the trans-pubertal scale with physical affection (2.88) and on the post-pubertal scale with general support (3.51) and physical affection (3.40). In fact, fathers with sons who were classified as post-pubertal differed more than the other two groups on the four subscales. Table 12 provides evidence that fathers and sons did not perceive father involvement the same way.

Similar trends were confirmed when Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to determine the relationships between the sons' pubertal status and the level of father involvement. For the purpose of the analysis, raw scores from the *PSI* were used (both father's and son's scores). Table 12 depicts these relationships as the sons rated their perceptions of their own pubertal status and their fathers' involvement; compared with their fathers' rating of their pubertal status and perception of their own involvement in the relationship.

Table 12

---

Correlations between Pubertal Status and PSI Subscales: Fathers' Ratings by Sons' Ratings

---

	PSI Subscales			
<u>Pubertal Status</u>	<u>GenSupport</u>	<u>PhyAffection</u>	<u>Compship</u>	<u>SustContact</u>
Father's Rating	-.04	-.15	.09	-.07
Son's Rating	-.13	-.29**	-.21**	-.21**

---

Note. \*\* Correlation is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). N = 114 fathers; 160 sons.

These correlations demonstrated first that fathers do not perceive changes in the relationship between their sons' pubertal status and their own involvement with their sons. According to the fathers, there were no statistically significant relationships between pubertal status and father involvement. Although not statistically significant, the highest

correlation for the fathers was between the variables of pubertal status and physical affection. The correlation of  $r = -.15$  was both weak and negative, suggesting that as sons' increased in pubertal maturity, there was a perceived decrease in physical affection from their fathers.

On the other hand, the young men in the study perceived relationships between their pubertal status and their involvement with their father. The highest correlation ( $r = -.29$ ) among the sons' scoring occurred on the variables of pubertal status and physical affection. Once again, this correlation suggests that as sons increased in pubertal development, there was a decrease in the amount of affection their fathers demonstrated to them. There were similar patterns with sustained contact and companionship. That is, as the young men scored higher on pubertal status, their ratings of their fathers on sustained contact and companionship decreased. According to the sons' perceptions, the null hypothesis was rejected. There was a statistically significant relationship between adolescent pubertal status and father involvement. As young men physically mature and develop, their perceived involvement with their fathers decreases.

#### *Father and Son Identity*

**Research Question #3:** Is there a relationship between father psychosocial development and son psychosocial development?

Ho: There is no relationship between father psychosocial development and son psychosocial development.

Pearson correlations were utilized to assess the magnitude and the direction of the relationship between the two variables - father and son psychosocial development. Fathers' scale (information, normative, diffuse) scores on the Identity Style Inventory (*ISI*) were correlated with sons' scale (achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, diffusion) scores on the Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (*EOM-EIS*). Table 13 presents the correlations between the *ISI* subscales and the *EOM-EIS* subscales.

Table 13

---

Correlations between Father Psychosocial Status and Son Psychosocial Status

---

Father and Son Psychosocial Status			
Psychosocial Status	Diffusion	Normative	Information
Achievement	-.10	.08	.10
Diffusion	-.03	-.25*	-.23*
Moratorium	-.01	-.19	-.17
Foreclosure	-.12	.09	.13

Note. \*\* Correlation is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). \* Correlation is statistically significant at the 0.05 level (2 tailed). N = 119 fathers; 164 sons.

There were two relationships that did prove to be statistically significant. First, there was a statistically significant correlation between the normative cognitive style for

fathers and the diffused identity style for sons (-.25). Therefore, as fathers' scores increased on the normative scale, sons' scores decreased on the diffused scale. There was also a relationship between the information cognitive style for fathers and the diffused identity style for sons (-.22). Once again, the relationship was negative, as the scores increased on the fathers' information scale, they decreased on the sons' diffusion scale. Therefore, the higher fathers' scored on the information scale, the lower sons' scored on the diffused scale. If a son scored low on diffusion, it could be implied that he was moving towards foreclosure or moratorium.

There was a statistically significant relationship between the sons' psychosocial status and the fathers' psychosocial status. Specifically, there was a relationship between the fathers' normative cognitive style and the sons' diffused identity style; there was also a relationship between fathers' information style and sons' diffused style. Therefore, there was statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

### *Identity and Involvement*

**Research Question #4:** Is there a relationship between psychosocial development and father involvement?

Ho1: There is no relationship between a father's psychosocial development and his involvement with his son

Ho2: There is no relationship between a son's psychosocial development and his involvement with his father.

In this case, the independent variable was identity status, and the dependent

variable was father involvement. As with research question #2, both father and son responses to father involvement were treated separately by examining their individual scores on the *PSI*. Pearson correlations were used to determine the magnitude and direction of the fathers impression of his own identity status with his perceptions regarding his involvement with his son. Secondly, Pearson  $r$  analyses were also used to correlate the sons' responses pertaining to his identity status with his perception of his father's involvement. Third, the sons' perception of his identity was correlated with the fathers' perception of his involvement with his son. Finally, the fathers' perception of his identity status was correlated with the sons perception of paternal involvement. Table 14 addresses  $H_{01}$  and presents correlations of fathers' identity status with his perception of his involvement with his son.

Table 14

Correlations of Fathers' Psychosocial Status with Fathers' Ratings of Involvement

PSI Subscale	Psychosocial Status		
	Information (N=119)	Diffuse (N=110)	Normative (N=116)
Gen Support (N=121)	.18	-.29**	.25**
Physical Affection (N=120)	.10	-.09	.09
Companionship (N=119)	.15	-.33**	.20*
Sustained Contact (N=115)	-.08	-.06	-.03

Note. \*\* Correlation is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). \* Correlation is statistically significant at the 0.05 level (2 tailed).

All of the correlations on the diffuse scale are negative when correlated with the *PSI* subscales. This suggests that the higher fathers scored on diffusion (avoiding the solving of problems), the less involved they are with their sons. Specifically, a moderate association exists between the diffused orientation and general support ( $r = -.29$ ). This suggests as fathers' scores increased on the diffused scale, they decreased on the general support scale. Another significant association was reported between the normative style scale and the general support scale ( $r = .25$ ). In this case, as fathers' scores increased on the normative scale, they also increased on the general support scale.

The strongest relationship among these variables was between the scales of diffusion and companionship ( $r = -.33$ ); as fathers' scores increased on the diffused scale, they decreased on the companionship scale. Finally, there was a statistically significant relationship between the normative scale and companionship ( $r = .20$ ). In this case, as fathers' scores on the normative scale increased, so did their scores on the companionship scale. In summary of the data presented in Table 14, there was statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis ( $H_01$ ). There were statistically significant relationships between fathers' psychosocial status and their involvement with their sons.

Table 15 addresses  $H_02$  by examining the relationships between sons' psychosocial status and his perception of father involvement. In this case, there were seven correlations that were statistically significant compared to four on the fathers data. Notice the higher correlations when sons' perceptions were used in the analysis, especially on the scale of foreclosure.



Table 15

Correlations of Sons' Psychosocial Status with Sons' Ratings of Father Involvement

PSI Subscale	Psychosocial Status			
	Achieved	Moratorium	Foreclosed	Diffused
	(N=152)	(N=146)	(N=143)	(N=140)
General Support (N=171)	.20*	.08	.42**	-.11
Physical Affection (N=171)	.08	.11	.32**	.03
Companionship (N=172)	.27**	.17*	.46**	-.02
Sustained Contact (N=172)	.08	.10*	.34**	.06

Note. \*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); \* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 15 reveals several significant relationships between the variables of identity status and father involvement. First, the achieved scale correlated positively with the *PSI* subscales of general support ( $p < .05$ ) and companionship ( $p < .01$ ). Thus, as sons' scores on achievement increased, so did their perception of their fathers' general support (security in the relationship) and companionship (time together). Second, there was a positive relationship between the moratorium psychosocial status and father-son companionship ( $p < .05$ ). Once again, as the sons' score on the moratorium scale increased, their ratings of their fathers' companionship increased too. Finally, the foreclosed identity status was positively correlated with every *PSI* scale ( $p < .01$ ). The

strongest correlation occurred between the variables of foreclosure and companionship ( $r = .46$ ). Hence, the higher sons' scored on the foreclosure scale, the higher ratings they gave their fathers on companionship, or time together. There were also strong correlations between the foreclosed scale and general support ( $r = .42$ ), and the foreclosed scale and physical affection ( $r = .32$ ). These findings suggest that adolescent young men who conform to the beliefs of their fathers are more likely to be involved with them. As was noted before, there was one item added to the *PSI* to evaluate satisfaction in the father-son relationship. The satisfaction item also demonstrated a strong and positive correlation with the identity status of foreclosure ( $r = .31$ ). Therefore, there was statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ). There was a relationship between sons' psychosocial status and their involvement with their fathers.

Table 16 summarizes the relationships between sons' psychosocial status and their fathers' rating of his own involvement with his son. The difference between this correlation and the previous one is that instead of the sons' rating of their fathers involvement, the fathers' rating of his own involvement was used.

Table 16

Correlations of Sons' Psychosocial Status with Fathers' Ratings of Own Involvement

PSI Subscale	Psychosocial Status			
	Achieved (N=152)	Moratorium (N=146)	Foreclosed (N=143)	Diffused (N=140)
General Support (N=121)	.11	-.15	.31**	-.20
Physical Affection (N=120)	.04	.05	.23*	.07
Companionship (N=119)	.22*	-.09	.17	-.08
Sustained Contact (N=115)	.06	.03	.06	.03

Note. \* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). \*\* Correlation is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

An examination of Table 16 reveals a positive correlation between the achieved identity status and the *PSI* subscale of companionship ( $r = .22$ ;  $p < .05$ ). As the sons' scores increased on the achievement scale, fathers' scores also increased on the companionship scale. Hence, one who scores high on the achievement scale, that is, one who has a future oriented perspective, is self-confident, and sets goals and seeks to accomplish (Achieved scale) then tends to have a father who scores high on the companionship scale (enjoys spending more time with his son) when compared to those young men in moratorium, foreclosure, or diffusion.

There was also evidence of a relationship between the foreclosed identity status and general support ( $r = .31$ ;  $p < .01$ ). As sons' scores on the foreclosed scale increased,

so did the fathers' scores on general support. Thus, the more a young man chooses to adopt his fathers values and beliefs (Foreclosure scale), the more secure (general support scale) the father feels the relationship is. There was also a statistically significant relationship between foreclosure and physical affection ( $r = .23$ ). In this case, the more a young man chooses to follow the values and beliefs of his father (Foreclosure scale), the more physical affection his father demonstrates to him.

Once again, there was statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis. According to the sons' psychosocial status ratings and the fathers' ratings of their own involvement, there was a relationship between sons' psychosocial status and fathers' perception of their involvement. However, there appears to be more statistically significant relationships when sons rate their fathers' involvement (Table 15), when compared to when fathers rate their own involvement (Table 16).

For Table 17, instead of correlating sons' psychosocial status and fathers' rating of their own involvement, the fathers' psychosocial status was correlated with sons' ratings of their fathers' involvement. When sons rate their fathers' involvement, more variables yield statistical significance.

Table 17

Correlations of Fathers' Psychosocial Status with Sons' Ratings of Father Involvement

PSI Subscale	Psychosocial Status		
	Information (N=119)	Diffused (N=110)	Normative (N=116)
General Support (N=171)	.30**	-.27**	.17
Physical Affection (N=171)	.25**	-.00	.15
Companionship (N=172)	.20*	-.25**	.13
Sustained Contact (N=172)	.08	-.12	-.02

Note. \*\* Correlation is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). \* Correlation is statistically significant at the 0.05 level (2 tailed).

An examination of Table 17 reveals several statistically significant correlations and should be compared to Table 14. The difference between these two tables is that on Table 14, fathers rated their own involvement; on Table 17 sons' rated their fathers' involvement. As with Table 14, Table 17 clearly demonstrates all negative correlations on the diffused scale. This finding implies that the higher fathers scored on the diffused scale (avoiding problem solving), the less involved they are with their sons, particularly regarding companionship and general support.

Specifically, there was a statistically significant relationship between the information oriented style and general support ( $r = .30$ ;  $p < .01$ ). Thus, as fathers' scores

on the information scale increased, so did their scores on general support. The implication here is that fathers who seek out and evaluate relevant information before making decisions (Information orientation) are more likely have a son who feels secure (general support) in the relationship. Another statistically significant relationship exists between the information oriented style and physical affection ( $r = .25$ ;  $p < .01$ ). Fathers who scored high on the information orientation are more likely, according to their sons' perceptions, to score high on the physical affection scale when compared to the normative or diffused scale. Once again, there was statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis. There was a relationship between fathers' psychosocial status and their sons' rating of father involvement.

Overall, after examining all four correlation tables, there were statistically significant relationships to report between psychosocial status and father involvement. In fact, both the sons' psychosocial status and their fathers' mediate father involvement. When fathers rated themselves on both psychosocial development and involvement and when their sons rated them, there were several statistically significant relationships reported and thus, the null hypothesis of no relationship between psychosocial status and involvement was rejected.

### *Summary*

The first research question addressed the relationship between pubertal status and psychosocial status. For both father and son ratings of physical development, the foreclosed identity status was the only scale that was related to pubertal status. In fact, an

examination of the means of each pubertal group demonstrated statistically significant differences among all three groups. The second question assessed the relationship between pubertal status and father involvement. The fathers' responses did not yield any statistically significant findings between the variables of pubertal status and father involvement. However, the responses of the sons demonstrated statistical significance - for them, there was a relationship between pubertal status and their perceptions of father involvement. Fathers appear to be more involved with their sons before the onset of puberty and then after puberty; however, father involvement decreases during the apex of puberty. The third question dealt with the relationship between fathers' psychosocial status and sons' psychosocial status. There were several relationships between these variables that proved to be statistically significant, such as the negative association between fathers' normative and information cognitive styles and their sons' diffused identity style. Finally, question four addressed the relationship between father identity, son identity and father-son involvement. Both fathers and their sons perceived relationships between psychosocial status and father involvement. In Chapter V, these relationships are explored further.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Results from this study have demonstrated that there are relationships between pubertal status, identity status and father-son involvement. The following summary reviews features of the sample and some of the measurement issues. Observations regarding the hypothesis testing and results are also offered, as well as the limitations of the study. Finally, directions for future research are introduced.

#### Methodological Review

##### *Sample*

Although the sample was discussed in Chapter III, a quick summation is presented here. Fathers and sons from Northern Utah and Southern Idaho constituted the sample for this study. There were a total of 173 survey sets analyzed in the data; 123 father and son pairs, and 50 sons who turned in surveys without their fathers. The young men in the survey ranged from ages 11 to 18, while the fathers ranged from 31 to 61. Over 70% of the sample were members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

##### *Measurement*

The sons who participated in the study completed a four-part, 98-item questionnaire which, assessed demographic information, pubertal status, father involvement and psychosocial status. Instruments, which comprised the survey, included the Peterson Development Scale (*PDS*), Parental Support Inventory (*PSI*), and the Extended Version of the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (*EOM-EIS*). Internal



consistency was moderate to high for all subscales on each of the measures. Moreover, each of the measures demonstrated moderate levels of construct validity.

The fathers' surveys tapped the same domains, but consisted of 75 questions. In addition to the demographic information, their survey consisted of the *PDS*, *PSI*, and Identity Style Inventory (*ISI*). Once again, internal consistency was moderate to high on all of the subscales for each of the measures. Furthermore, each measure evidenced adequate levels of construct validity.

#### Summary of Findings

There were four questions addressed in this study. 1) Is there a relationship between a young man's physical development and his psychosocial status? The answer is "yes." There is a relationship between a young man's pubertal status and his identity status. 2) Is there a relationship between a young man's pubertal status and his father's involvement with him? To this question also, the answer is "yes." There is a relationship between a young man's pubertal status and his relationship with his father. 3) Is there a relationship between a father's psychosocial development and his son's psychosocial development? Yes. There is a relationship between father and son psychosocial development. 4) Is there a relationship between father and son psychosocial development and father involvement? The answer is "yes." There are relationships between a young man's psychosocial status, a father's psychosocial status, and father involvement. The following discussion will elaborate on these relationships, identifying and interpreting themes and trends in the data.

### *Puberty and Identity*

Research Question #1: Is there a relationship between male adolescent physical development (pubertal status) and male adolescent psychosocial development (identity status)? Table 8 reveals several notable trends. The young men classified as pre-pubertal scored the highest on every *EOM-EIS* scale (achievement, diffusion, foreclosure, and moratorium) when compared to the trans and post-pubertal groups. Would such a trend be expected? Perhaps the explanation lies in Erikson's theory of psychosocial development.

It was Erikson (1963) who viewed children between the ages of six to eleven in the stage of development known as industry vs inferiority. In this stage of psychosocial development, sexual and aggressive drives are temporarily suspended and boys are often more tranquil, composed, and secure when compared to other stages of development. Therefore, it is possible that the young men in this study who were classified as "pre-pubertal" were actually in the industry vs inferiority stage, which is hypothesized to be the calm before the pubertal storm. Erikson emphasized that age does not define the stage of psychosocial development (Snarey, 1993), but experiences do. These pre-pubertal young men would be more secure in their family relationships and in their feelings about themselves when in the industry vs inferiority stage of development.

The young men in the study who were placed in the trans and post-pubertal groups can most likely be categorized into Erikson's stage five: identity vs role confusion. During this stage, sexual drives, which were once latent, emerge and can overwhelm the male

adolescent. The young male also must adapt to physical growth, individuation and separation from parents, and sexual identity development. These stressors have been associated with low self-esteem at the onset of puberty (Sinkkonen, Anttila, & Siimes, 1998). Their new social roles and responsibilities can confuse young men at this psychosocial stage of development. Furthermore, Erikson (1963) argued that puberty is the catalyst for adolescent identity crisis; therefore, the young adolescent male's primary role during stage five is to establish a new sense of identity through a stage of moratorium.

Before the onset of puberty, much of a young man's identity comes from his father. In fact, Yablonsky (1990) argues that prior to puberty, fathers and sons tend to have an "ego-blending" (or shared-identity) type of relationship. However, during the trans-pubertal stage, fathers and sons tend to separate or withdraw from each other (Greene & Grimsley, 1990), as young men seek to redefine their identity.

Such examination of theory is useful in explaining trends, such as why the trans-pubertal young men scored lowest on the achievement scale ( $M = 64.48$ ) when compared with the other two groups. The young men in this group (trans-pubertal) also scored relatively high on the moratorium scale ( $M = 60.06$ ). The moratorium stage reflects a low commitment, yet a high level of exploration to a set of values and beliefs. Further, a moratorium refers to the process of forging an identity through the exploration of many possibilities; moratorium leads a young man into becoming something else - finding a new identity. It would seem appropriate to infer that the reason the young men's scores on the moratorium scale were relatively close together among each of the pubertal groups is

because throughout puberty, they are engaged in forging their identity. Hence, their commitment to values and beliefs is low, but their level of exploration is high. Recent research has suggested that boys in mid (trans) puberty score lower on self-control, emotional tone, and self-image when compared to boys in pre and post puberty. Moreover, these young men tend to be hostile and aggressive due to hormonal imbalances caused by high levels of testosterone (Sinkkonen et al., 1998).

After the one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between the three pubertal groups on the four scales of identity (achieved, foreclosed, moratorium, diffused), the only statistically significant difference between groups was on the scale of foreclosure. The LSD post hoc test revealed that the mean differences occurred between the pre-pubertal and the post-pubertal group, and between the trans-pubertal and post-pubertal group. Why would statistically significant differences between group means occur on the scale of foreclosure?

Foreclosure is characterized by a high level of commitment to a belief or value with little or no exploration. Young men who score high on the foreclosed scale rarely engage in questioning, and often follow the values and beliefs of their parents (Patterson, Sochting, & Marcia, 1992). In fact, such young men are often engaged in becoming what their parents want them to be (Marcia, 1966). According to the foreclosure subscale on Table 8, there was a 3.59 scale score difference between the pre-pubertal and trans-pubertal groups; a 5.51 scale score difference between the trans-pubertal and post-pubertal groups; and a 9.10 scale score difference between the pre-pubertal and post-

pubertal groups. These were profound differences!

It would be expected that the pre-pubertal group would score highest on foreclosure because these young men are most often between the ages of 11 and 13. This group would tend to be more influenced by their parents beliefs and values than the other two pubertal groups. In fact, the post-pubertal group scored the lowest on the foreclosure scale. Here, most of these young men range between the ages of 16 to 18. At this point in their lives, there is probably more interaction with peers than with family (Greene & Grimsley, 1990; Harris & Morgan, 1991; Steinberg, 1988). Moreover, there is also more distance, mobility (usually driving by this point) and independence at this stage of adolescence. According to Erikson's theory, it would be expected that post-pubertal young men would be less foreclosed than their pre-pubertal and trans-pubertal counterparts. Once through moratorium, these young men would have a sense of ownership regarding their own beliefs and values. Hence, the low foreclosure scale score (51.67) for the post-pubertal group, and the high foreclosure scale score (60.77) for the pre-pubertal groups. In summary, recent research, Erikson's psychosocial theory of development, and Marcia's contribution to identity are useful to explain these relationships between puberty and psychosocial status. There are statistically significant relationships between a young man's pubertal status and his psychosocial status.

#### *Pubertal Status and Father Involvement*

Research Question #2: Is there a relationship between male adolescent pubertal status and father involvement? Both father and sons responses to this question were

solicited. Fathers' were asked to rate their involvement with their sons' on four scales: general support, physical affection, companionship, and sustained contact. General support pertains to the young man feeling secure in his relationship with his father and being able to count on him in a time of need. The physical affection scale particularly addresses the father embracing and kissing his son. Companionship pertains to fathers and sons spending time together, enjoying each others company, and talking together. Finally, the sustained contact scale addresses the father letting his son sit on his lap and picking his son up for safety reasons (Barber & Thomas, 1986). For the purpose of this study, each of these areas was used as criteria for involvement, although sustained contact would be expected only with younger children. Nevertheless, it was supposed that on the factors of physical affection and sustained contact, there would be a decrease in subscale means as the sons physically develop and mature. In fact, this trend is documented on Table 9, where it is clear that as young men move through puberty, the amount of father-son interaction decreases. Father's rated themselves relatively high in terms of physical affection when their sons are pre-pubertal ( $M=15.11$ ); however, when their son's were post-pubertal, they ranked themselves much lower in terms of physical affection ( $M = 12.91$ ). The same trends can be noted on the sustained contact scale. From Table 8, it can also be inferred that general support and companionship does not change much as son's move through the pubertal process (according to fathers). The one-way analysis of variance did not find any statistically significant difference between these groups on the four factors.

The data from the son's *PSI* scores are useful in understanding these relationships further. From Table 10, there is evidence that fathers and sons withdraw from each other during the pubertal process. There were statistically significant mean differences between all three pubertal groups on each of the subscales. In fact, differences between the three groups on general support (security in the relationship), physical affection, and sustained contact were consequential. According to the son's surveyed, pubertal status does affect father involvement.

The findings in this study are supported by previous research. Palkovitz (1997) has argued that father involvement tends to vary across time in relation to social ecology and life circumstances. In this study, not only does father involvement vary with pubertal status, but decreased across time. Is it the fathers who withdraw, or the sons? There is evidence for mutual withdraw. Harris and Morgan (1991) reported that as young men become older and move through the pubertal process, they become more distant from their parents in general and tend to do fewer things with their families. Simmons and Blyth (1987) reported that pubertal change is often the cue that a new-role, or identity is being assumed. In fact, MacDermid and Crouter (1995) found that pubertal status could be empirically linked to father-son withdrawal (See also Steinberg, 1988). Clark-Lempers and associates (1991) reported that as sons move through puberty, their need for paternal affection decreases. In fact, they also reported that when compared to middle and late adolescents, early adolescents rank their relationship with their fathers higher on the dimensions of physical affection, companionship, and general support, as was

demonstrated in this study. Furthermore, the battle of individuation vs connection (Adams, Dyk, & Bennion, 1990) transpires as the son begins to forge his individual identity (Yablonsky, 1990) and pull-away from his father. The findings of this study are in concert with previous studies: Sons perceive disengagement from their fathers during puberty.

Moreover, MacDermid and Crouter (1995) discovered in their study that while many boys are encountering puberty, their fathers appeared to be facing mid-life problems of their own. Could mid-life issues impact the father-son relationship? Could the fathers preoccupation with his own life cloud the relationship he has with his son? Certainly. It was Erikson (1963) who postulated that during mid-life, men enter the stage of generativity vs self-absorption. Generativity implies nurturing and protecting offspring. On the other hand, a father could enter the stage of self-absorption (preoccupation with own mid life problems and issues) and subsequently distance himself from his son as he becomes "absorbed" with his own problems. At this point, the withdrawal could magnify and intensify; hence, the more the father withdraws the more the son pulls away as well. Martin (1985) supports this notion by explaining that "The adolescent push toward an independent identity is at times expressed in the defiant rejection of a caring father. The adolescent's insecurity and moodiness may push the father away at times when the father, too, is looking for recognition and affirmation of his lifestyle decisions" (p. 176).

Previously, it was documented that during adolescence, fathers and daughters tend to separate from each other (Steinberg, 1987). This study suggests that the same



tendency is true for fathers and sons. Distance is created between fathers and sons as the young men develop closer bonds with their peers and seek to establish their own identity and individuality (Clark-Lempers et al., 1991).

Perception is also another critical issue to consider with research question #2.

Table 11 presents differences between father and son responses on the same *PSI* scales. In every case except the trans-pubertal group (see general support scale), fathers reported higher scores. There was more than a 7.6 percent discrepancy on the scale of physical affection and a 8.6 percent difference on general support at post-puberty. In fact, on the item that measured relationship satisfaction between fathers and sons, there was a low correlation ( $r = .12$ ). Hence, there was not much agreement between fathers and sons on satisfaction in the relationship. The data in Table 11 clearly demonstrates that either fathers exaggerate the quality of their relationship with their sons; or sons understate the quality of the relationship. These tendencies correspond to the findings of Acock and Bengtson (1980), who reported that children and parents perceive family relationships differently. In their study, parents who thought they were "cool" or "with-it" were actually perceived by their children as being strict and traditional. Furthermore, parents did not perceive a "generation-gap" between themselves and their children; but their children did. More recent work by Paulson and Sputa (1996) sustained the notion that parents think they are more responsive and involved with their families than do their children.

Another matter to mention is the concept of reciprocity or bidirectionality

(Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Could a son's temperament during trans-puberty (when testosterone, hostility, and emotions are on edge) cause the father to pull away? In a recent study, parents reported using more verbal aggression and engaging in more "heated" discussions with sons at trans-puberty than at the other two stages of pubertal development. Sons also reported more "heated" or "charged" discussions with their parents when they were more physically developed than when they were less developed (Sagrestano, McCormick, Paikoff, & Holmbeck, 1998; See also Beaumont, 1996). Is the separation entirely the son's fault, or could the father's temperament during mid-life cause distancing as well? We rarely talk in terms of "difficult" parents (See Kawaguchi, Welsh, Powers, & Rostosky, 1998) or "difficult fathers" for that matter; but perhaps it is time to look at both sides of father-son disengagement.

In summary, there is a relationship between adolescent male physical development and father involvement. Although fathers did not report any statistically significant relationships between these variables, the sons did. These findings have also been supported by previous studies. Erikson's psychosocial theory of development and Marcia's contribution to identity are also useful to explain these relationships. Future studies could focus on bridging the gap between perception and reality, and how fathers and sons can effectively mediate these differences. For example, if sons perceive that their father is distant, but the father does not - it will be difficult to strengthen the relationship. However, if a father was aware of the sons perceived distance issues and was not defensive, the relationship could be enhanced. Another suggestion for future research

would include actual "in- home" observations. Researchers could then determine if actual live or videotaped home visits disclosed the same tendencies or patterns that the data from the pencil-paper measures revealed. This would be an effective way to negotiate these differences and validate father and son self-reporting.

### *Father and Son Identity*

Research question #3: Is there a relationship between father psychosocial development and son psychosocial development? One would anticipate that perhaps a father who scored high on the *information* scale would have a son who scored high on the *achieved* scale, or at least on *moratorium*, or a father who scored high on the *norm* orientation might have a son who scored high on the *foreclosed* scale. However, none of these relationships were observed when Pearson correlations were obtained to determine association between these variables.

However, there were some relationships that were statistically significant and should be mentioned. First, there was a negative association between fathers' normative scale scores and sons' diffused scale scores (See Table 13). The Pearson correlation ( $r = -.25$ ) suggests that as fathers' scores on the normative scale increased sons' scores on the diffused scale decreased. Berzonsky (1990) argued that individuals who score high on the normative scale are foreclosed; they focus on the norms and expectations held by significant others in their lives. Hence, these are fathers who feel strongly about their beliefs, which have been handed down by their own families. Low commitment and low exploration characterize young men who score high on the diffuse scale. They follow the

path of least resistance and present themselves as having a carefree lifestyle (Patterson, Sochting, & Marcia, 1992).

Erikson's (1963) psychosocial theory is useful in explaining this phenomenon. Perhaps the intergenerational transmission of values and beliefs is helpful in explaining why fathers who score high on foreclosure would have sons who score low on diffusion. Fathers who score high on the norm orientation (foreclosed) engage in little exploration. Perhaps their family or religion has influenced their values and beliefs and they live according to the beliefs of their families or the institutions they follow. Sons' low score on diffusion actually suggests that they may be moving towards foreclosure (like their fathers) or even into moratorium.

The other relationship which was statistically significant was the fathers' information scale scores and sons' diffuse scale scores (-.23). It should be pointed out that they only share 5 percent of the variance; that is, only 5 percent of the information scale score can be explained by the son's diffuse scale score. Individuals who scored high on the information scale are self-explorers, and seek out and evaluate relative information before making decisions (Berzonsky, 1990). In looking at the intergenerational transmission of values and beliefs, it is possible that fathers who score high on the information scale are less likely to have sons who score high on the diffuse scale. Perhaps these sons have observed their fathers making informed decisions and are moving towards moratorium (low commitment; high exploration) or achievement (high commitment; high exploration). Snarey (1993) reported that sons' cognitive and problem solving behavior is

positively associated with their fathers involvement and parenting style and that fathers' level of moral reasoning is positively correlated with their sons' level of moral development. It could be argued that the *ISI* and *EOM-EIS* do in fact assess cognitive development and moral reasoning, and that this study provides evidence that there can be an intergenerational transmission of values, beliefs, and cognitive styles (Snarey, 1993). Father and son psychosocial status is related.

In summary, there is a statistically significant relationship between fathers' information and normative scale scores and son's diffused scale scores. Further research should be conducted in this area to better understand the intergenerational transmission of values, beliefs, and ultimately, psychosocial status. It seems probable that adolescent psychosocial status could be influenced by parental psychosocial status, but these relationships should be examined more thoroughly.

#### *Psychosocial Development and Father Involvement*

Research question #4: Is there a relationship between psychosocial development and father involvement? For example, could individuals' psychosocial identity status affect their family relationships? As with research question #2, both father and son responses to father involvement were treated separately by examining both father and son scale scores on the *PSI*.

The first hypothesis addressed the relationship between fathers' psychosocial development and their involvement with their sons. The first Pearson correlation performed was solely based on the fathers responses for involvement and psychosocial

status. Every correlation coefficient on the diffuse scale was negative. Generally speaking, the "Diffuse/Avoidant Orientation involves attempts to avoid confronting problems as long as possible" (Berzonsky, 1990, p. 161). Therefore, fathers who typically avoid confronting problems are also prone to be less involved with their sons when compared fathers who score high on the information or normative orientation. Erikson (1963) argues that adults eventually enter into a stage of generativity vs self-absorption. Perhaps fathers who avoid conflict and decision making are actually involved in a form of self-absorption. This notion can be confirmed by examining the Pearson correlations in Table 14. The strongest relationship occurred between the diffuse scale and the scale of companionship ( $r = -.33$ ). Fathers who score high on the diffuse scale tend to spend less time with their sons when compared to fathers who score high on the normative or information scales. Is it possible that diffuse oriented fathers are in the stage of adult development Erikson referred to as "self-absorption"? Recent research suggests that when men are preoccupied with problems, they distance themselves from their wives and children (Aldous, Mulligan, & Bjarnson, 1998). Such an assumption would make sense, but would also merit further explanation. Perhaps further research could link the diffuse orientation with the father's success as a breadwinner. It has recently been reported that "feeling like a failure in the breadwinning role is associated with demoralization for fathers, which causes their relationships with their children to deteriorate" (Doherty et al., 1998, p. 283). In fact, a fathers' work identity may be associated with his beliefs and values about his role as a parent (Marsiglio, 1993). Thus, there could be an association

between diffusion and income level or work situation. At least these variables merit further exploration.

There was also a moderate correlation between the normative (foreclosed) scale and the general support scale ( $r = .25$ ). Fathers' who are set in their beliefs and feel secure in their identity will most likely be able to provide security in their relationships with their sons' who are wanting to pull away and to forge their own identity. It is the sons' psychosocial task to achieve a degree of separation from his father during adolescence. Fathers who are comfortable with their beliefs would be able to lend support and encouragement from the "sidelines," so to speak, and be supportive of their son's gradual disengagement (Snarey, 1993), not feeling like they would have to "hover" over their sons. Providing this security through commitment, consecration, and connection is the essence of Erikson's notion of generativity, or more specifically - "generative fathering" (Hawkins & Dollahite, 1997).

When sons in the study ranked their fathers involvement (Table 17), many statistical relationships were noted. For instance, general support ( $r = .30$ ;  $p < .01$ ), physical affection ( $r = .25$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and commitment ( $r = .20$ ;  $p < .05$ ) were all positively related with the *information* orientation. Fathers who score high on the information scale are often men who "seek out, elaborate, and evaluate relevant information before making decisions and committing themselves" (Berzonsky, 1990, p. 161). The data presented in Table 17 suggests that such fathers are more involved with their sons when compared to fathers who score high on the diffuse or normative scales. Information oriented fathers

tend to be open-minded to the things their adolescent son is experiencing; they probably engage in gathering all of the facts before making judgements and decisions regarding their sons' behaviors. Fathers who are supportive, demonstrate affection, and spend time with their sons are certainly engaged in generativity.

Table 15 presents the second hypothesis: Is there a relationship between the son's psychosocial status and his involvement with his father? There are several relationships that demonstrated statistical significance and merit further discussion. First, it appears that young men who obtained higher achievement scores felt secure in their relationships with their fathers and were satisfied with the amount of time they spent with their fathers. Individuals who score high on the achieved scale typically have a future oriented perspective, tend to do well in school, are emotionally mature, ambitious, prosocial, and intellectually receptive. Research on parent-child interaction and bidirectional effects would confirm that such young men would be well received by their fathers (See Ambert, 1997). In fact, Barber and Thomas (1986) demonstrated that there are strong associations between children's prosocial behaviors (i.e. "achievement status) and parental supportive behaviors. Moreover, there are strong correlations between parental physical affection and pre-adolescent self-esteem. The findings in this study confirm these trends and patterns.

Table 15 also illustrates that sons who scored high on foreclosure are more involved with their fathers than sons who scored highest on achievement, diffusion, or moratorium. In fact, sons who scored high on foreclosure spend more time with their fathers than any other group ( $r = .46$ ;  $p < .01$ ). Such a tendency would make sense. A



foreclosed orientation would describe a son who had adopted the values and beliefs of his parents, and is not searching for anything new. They take pleasure in following their fathers advice and counsel. Obviously, if a father has a son who enjoys listening to him and following his lifestyle, he will engage in generativity through physical affection, time together, and providing security in the relationship. This finding can be supported by Amato (1990) who documented that children who receive strong support from their parents tend to have positive family experiences and enjoy being with their families.

Table 16 correlates sons' psychosocial status with fathers' rating of their own involvement. Still, by using fathers' ratings of their involvement, the same patterns exist, as did sons' ratings of involvement. Sons who score high on the achievement scale reported spending more time with their fathers than any other group. Perhaps sons who score high on achievement reflect such characteristics because of the help and involvement from their fathers. Snarey's (1993) four decade study revealed that sons who succeeded educationally and occupationally had fathers who were involved with them in three distinct areas: social, intellectual, and physical-athletic. Research confirms that fathers who are involved with their children contribute to their overall well being (Harris, Furstenberg, & Marmer, 1998; Mackey, 1998).

Sons who score high on the foreclosed scale also received the most support and physical affection from their fathers than the other three groups (See Barber & Thomas, 1986). These young men would tend to believe what their fathers believe, and try to live their lives the way their fathers would want them to. It only makes sense that these

young men would be more involved with their fathers than the other three groups.

These findings help define the relationships between father and son psychosocial identity and father involvement. More research should be conducted in this area to replicate the current findings. Currently, theory and several empirical studies can only support these trends and patterns. More data is needed to further define and explain the relationships between psychosocial status and father involvement.

#### *Father and Son Time Together*

Finally, although not part of the original research questions, fathers and sons were asked to report the number of hours they spent together. Specifically, the questions on the survey read: "How much time do you spend with your father during a typical day (in hours)?" and "How much time do you spend with your father during a typical week (in hours)?" The questions for the fathers read the same way, asking them how much time during the day and week they spent with their sons. Thus, time per day and time per week (in hours) was correlated with father involvement and satisfaction. Table 18 presents the results of this analysis.

Table 18

---

Correlations between Time per Day, Time per Week, and Father Involvement

	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	GenSup	PhyAff	Compshp	SusCon	Satis
<u>Son's</u>							
Time per day	167	3.16	.22**	.18*	.25**	.22**	.33**
Time per week	167	24.19	.33**	.06	.32**	.27**	.35**
<u>Father's</u>							
Time per day	117	2.56	.03	.34**	.25**	.17	.14
Time per week	117	21.71	.16	.21*	.07	.11	.10

---

Note. \*\* Correlation is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) . \* Correlation is statistically significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 18 demonstrates the positive relationship between father involvement and time together. The more involved the father is with his son, the more time they seem to spend together. However, the sons reporting yielded more statistically significant relationships than did the fathers reporting. For the sons, companionship ( $r = .25$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and satisfaction ( $r = .33$ ;  $p < .01$ ) generated the strongest associations with time per day. For the fathers, physical affection ( $r = .34$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and companionship ( $r = .25$ ;  $p < .01$ ) produced the strongest correlations with time per day. Perhaps what this suggests is that what fathers need from sons, and what sons need from fathers to have a satisfying relationship is different, or at least what they believe constitutes a satisfactory relationship

is different. Fathers might feel that if they embrace their son occasionally, the relationship is healthy. However, sons seem to feel that "doing things together" is what makes the relationship satisfying.

At first glance, the amount of time fathers and sons report spending together seems exaggerated. However, these numbers correspond with other studies, such as McBride and Mills (1993) reporting 1.9 hours per day, Pleck (1997) reporting .5 to 1.0 hours per day, and then other studies which report estimates at 2.8 hours per day (Doherty et al., 1998). It is likely that the hours reported in this data are somewhat exaggerated. For instance, some sons reported spending up to 14 hours a day and 98 hours per week with their fathers; some fathers reported spending up to 10 hours a day and 80 hours a week with their sons. Nevertheless, there is statistical evidence to support the notion that the more time spent together yields greater satisfaction in the relationship for young men and greater physical affection from fathers.

#### Limitations

Internal validity refers to the extent to which a study rules out alternative explanations of the findings (Kazdin, 1982). Could other factors or influences be responsible for the results? Perhaps. Such alternative explanations should be mentioned. First, instrumentation was a concern because the survey was rather long (98 questions for the sons; 75 questions for the fathers). Perhaps some of the individuals who participated in the study did not comprehend the nature of the questions, or because of the length of the survey, simply began to circle the same answer choice on every item in order to "hurry

through the test.” Another instrumentation issue relates to how the survey was completed. Since sons were instructed to take the surveys home for completion, there is a chance that fathers and sons could have compared responses, or discussed how they would approach the questions before they actually completed the surveys. Demand characteristics could also have affected the outcome on the surveys. Since both fathers and sons knew that the study pertained to father and son relationships during adolescence, and perhaps wanted to present themselves a certain way, fathers could have “faked-good” in their responses, while a select few adolescents could have “faked-bad.” Moreover, since the surveys were filled out on a voluntary basis, there is a high probability that only fathers and sons who perceived their relationship as positive actually completed the surveys and turned them in. If a young man did not get along with his father, or was angry with him for some reason on the day the surveys were passed out, he probably would not approach his father and ask him to participate in the study. Therefore, perhaps only fathers and sons who perceived at least a good relationship together participated in the study.

There are several recommendations to reduce these threats to internal validity. First, having fathers and sons complete the surveys together is what makes this study unique. Preserving that feature should be paramount if the study is replicated. However, in the future, fathers and sons should complete the surveys independent of each other (but still during the same time period). This could imply having the son fill out his version of the survey in his Physical Education class at school, and then bringing the fathers version

home to his father. After completion, fathers could mail in their surveys. This methodology would eliminate the opportunity for fathers and sons to compare answers or fill out their surveys together. This would also provide an opportunity for fathers and sons who do not get along well to participate in the study.

External validity pertains to how generalizable the findings are to other populations and settings. Sampling strategy influences external validity. In this case, there are several concerns with the sample. Overall, the participants in the study came from communities with a narrow range of demographic characteristics (Southeastern Idaho, Northern Utah). Further, the sample size was adequate, but not large ( $N = 173$ ). It should also be mentioned that the sample was not nationally representative. For example, over 70 percent of the subjects were members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; and over 74 percent of the sample lived in intact families. Moreover, the sample was not random. Anyone who met the criteria (Adolescent son with a father) was invited to participate. Often, the school superintendents, or principals, or teachers dictated the sampling methodology. For instance, one teacher took the liberty to administer the survey to girls and their mothers. In another case, a school principal was informed that there was a great need to administer the surveys to 11th and 12th grade boys. Instead, he chose to administer the surveys to 9th graders.

In order to be able to generalize these findings to larger populations, more school districts throughout the country should participate, increasing the sample size drastically. Second, the sample should be random. This could be done by using multi-stage cluster

sampling to identify states, and then school districts, then schools, to classes, to individuals. Then, with the help of teachers, the survey could be administered to the young men. The use of mailing lists could also be employed, although the return rate is rather low. Face to face interviews could also be conducted on a small percentage of the total sample, and the responses could be compared to the paper and pencil measures. Moreover, a longitudinal design would be useful to validate the findings in this study.

### Recommendations

First, future research should focus on replication. This study was merely exploratory to establish relationships between the variables of pubertal status, psychosocial development, and father involvement. Relationships that have been established in this study should be confirmed and explained. For example, research question #2 addressed the relationship between pubertal status and father-involvement. There is evidence that pubertal cues may cause distancing between fathers and sons during adolescence. However, should that distance be negotiated? Or, are such distancing patterns necessary for both physical and emotional growth? (See Snarey, 1993; Steinberg, 1987).

Second, qualitative studies should be employed for both exploration and replication. There is a plethora of data that addresses absent fathers and father presence (Blankenhorn, 1995; Hawkins & Dollahite, 1997; Lamb, 1986; Popenoe, 1996; Snarey, 1993). What is lacking, however, is the *meaning* of fatherhood. At this juncture, social scientists really do not know *how* men father; they do not know what fathering means;

they do not know how men acquire and experience fathering; and still do not know how fathering is done. Hence, "[m]ore qualitative research [on fathering] is needed to explore the kinds of identity development and social negotiation that constitute the experience of fathering" (Doherty et al., 1998, p. 289).

Third, researchers could focus on father strengths. Since Stinnet and DeFrain's (1985) work on family strengths in the mid-eighties, not much has been said about family strengths recently, especially father strengths. What is a *good* father? How do *good* or *strong* fathers handle certain situations? This area merits further explanation.

Fourth, a reliable and valid instrument needs to be developed to specifically measure father involvement. Presently, there is disagreement in the family science community regarding what constitutes father involvement (Palkovitz, 1997). Snarey (1993) argues that involvement is couched in the domains of social-emotional, intellectual-academic, and physical-athletic, while Lamb (1986) contends that father involvement consists of interaction, accessibility, and responsibility. Others want to limit involvement to emotional and behavioral constructs (Harris et al, 1998), while a select few still want to measure involvement simply in terms of time spent together (Cooksey & Fondell, 1996). Regardless of what dimensions are used to assess father involvement, a measure should be developed that is user friendly and demonstrates strong reliability and validity.

Fifth, there is evidence that a father's belief system affects the way his son chooses to believe or act, particularly regarding psychosocial status. Further research should explore the comparison of the *EOM-EIS* to the *ISI*. Do these measures appropriately



access psychosocial identity? Researchers should be cautious in comparing fathers and sons on two different psychosocial status measures. Although there is some evidence that the two instruments are measuring the same constructs, is the evidence good enough? Perhaps a more universal measure could be developed that can be used to compare people of different ages.

Sixth, more research should focus on the amount of time father's spend with their sons, and how that time impacts other areas of the sons life (Snarey, 1993). For example, recent research has shown that young men do better academically when their fathers share meals with them, participate in activities with them, and help them with their homework when compared to sons who do not have a father as involved (Cooksey & Fondell, 1996). The factors that seem to make the largest impact in most family relationships are usually relatively small. Eating together, helping with homework, and good conversation. In light of this concept, research should also focus on non-custodial fathers and their relationships with their sons. What degree of influence can a father have who does not live in the home? If a father cannot eat with his son or help him with his homework because of distancing factors, what can he do to demonstrate and maintain closeness? Can emotional distance be mediated by physical distance?

Seventh, the strength and contribution of this research lies in the fact that fathers and sons were paired together. In several cases, they were administered the exact same survey, item for item. How then, do father and son perceptions differ so much on the same issues? For example, on the *Peterson Development Scale*, the intercorrelation for

the body hair item was  $r = .47$ , a relatively low agreement on an issue so concrete. Either the son has body hair or he doesn't, but for some reason, the perception was different for fathers and sons. It would be expected that a father would notice if his son were developing body hair. Likewise, there was a meager correlation ( $r = .38$ ) on the item that measured growth spurt. How could a father *not* be cognizant of his sons' growth spurt? Perhaps the sons were exaggerating their growth and fathers were under reporting it. The same is true with facial hair ( $r = .57$ ). It would seem that something so visible as facial hair would have a higher correlation.

This same tendency can be observed again when father involvement is measured. For instance, the inter-scale correlation for father-son companionship was  $r = .47$ . Items that measured father-son companionship were rather specific. For example, "My father spends time with me," and "My father likes to talk with me much of the time." There are only three choices on the Likert scale for these questions, however, according to the Pearson correlation, fathers and sons do not seem to have a high level of agreement on what it means to spend time together. What about satisfaction in the relationship? The correlation on the single item that measured satisfaction was  $r = .12$ . Clearly, there is not much agreement on what makes the relationship satisfactory. In fact, fathers reported the highest satisfaction if there was physical affection demonstrated in the relationship; sons reported the highest satisfaction ratings if their fathers spent time with them. More research and explanation is needed in this critical area of perception.

Eighth, the issue of father and son *needs* should be explored further. It appears

that what fathers need from their sons, and what sons need from their fathers is different. Such differences can contribute to the perceptions of what is, and what is not happening. Herein, is the essence of this research project. Here, in the area of needs and perceptions, more research needs to be done in order to better understand these issues and relationships.

Ninth, marriage and family counselors should become aware of 1) how puberty affects family relationships, 2) how mid-life issues impact father involvement, 3) and how perception influences all family relationships. For instance, in a counseling session, a young man may explain to a mental health professional that his father treats him harshly and rarely spends time with him. The father, on the other hand, may explain to the counselor that he and his son get along great. Who is right? Who is wrong? Who is the counselor going to believe? A mental health professional will be much more successful if he understands the role of perception. Therefore, there is a need for father-son research in the applied areas of the family sciences.

Tenth, professional journals should also focus these issues, providing helpful suggestions for mental health professionals who deal with fathers and sons in therapy. Furthermore, professional workshops and seminars could offer courses on father and son relationships, and specifically how puberty impacts the dynamics of the family.

## REFERENCES

- Acock, A.C., & Bengtson, V.L. (1980). Socialization and attribution processes: Actual versus perceived similarity among parents and youth. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42 (3), 501-515.
- Adams, G.R., Bennion, L., & Huh, K. (1987). Objective measure of ego identity status: A reference manual. Utah State University, Logan.
- Adams, G.R., Dyk, P., & Bennion, L.D. (1990). Parent-adolescent relationships and identity formation. In B.K. Barber & B.C. Rollins (Eds.), Parent-Adolescent Relationships. New York: University Press of America.
- Adams, G.R., & Grotevant, H.D. (1984). Development of an objective measure to assess ego identity in adolescence: Validation and replication. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 13 (5), 419-438.
- Aldous, J., Mulligan, G.M., & Bjarnason (1998). Fathering over time: What makes the differences? Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60 (4), 809-820.
- Almeida, D.M., & Galambos, N.L. (1991). Examining father involvement and the quality of father-adolescent relations. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 1 (2), 155-172.
- Amato, P.R. (1990). Dimensions of the family environment as perceived by children: A multidimensional scaling analysis. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52 (3), 613-620.

- Ambert, A. (1997). Parents, Children, and Adolescents: Interactive relationships and development in context. New York: The Hawthorn Press.
- Balcom, D.A. (1998). Absent fathers: Effects on abandoned sons. Journal of Men's Studies, 6 (3), 283-296.
- Barber, B.K., & Thomas, D.L. (1986). Diminsions of fathers' and mothers' supportive behavior: The case for physical affection. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48 (4), 783-794.
- Barber, B.K. (1997). Adolescent socialization in context. The role of connection, regulation, and autonomy in the family. Journal of Adolescent Research, 12 (1), 5-11.
- Beaumont, S.L. (1996). Adolescent girl's perceptions of conversations with mothers and friends. Journal of Adolescent Research, 11 (3), 325-346.
- Berzonsky, M.D.(1989). Identity style: Conceptualization and measurement. Journal of Adolescent Research, 4 (3), 268-282.
- Berzonsky, M.D. (1990). Self-construction over the life span: A process perspective on identity formation. In G.J. Neimeyer & R.A. Neimeyer (Eds.), Advances in personal construct psychology (Vol. I, pp. 155-186). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Berzonsky, M.D. (1992). Identity style and coping strategies. Journal of Personality, 60 (4), 771-787.

- Berzonsky, M.D., & Sullivan, C. (1992). Social-cognitive aspects of identity style: Need for cognition, experiential openness, and introspection. Journal of Adolescent Research, 7 (2), 140-155.
- Blankenhorn, D. (1995). Fatherless America. New York: Basic Books.
- Clark-Lempers, D.S., Lempers, J.D., & Ho, C. (1991). Early, middle, and late adolescent's perceptions of their relationships with significant others. Journal of Adolescent Research, 6 (3), 296-315.
- Cook, T.D., & Campbell, D.T. (1979). Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Cooksey, E.C., & Fondell, M.M. (1996). Spending time with his kids: Effects of family structure on fathers' and childrens' lives. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58 (3), 693-707.
- Crain, W. (1992). Theories of development: Concepts and applications. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- D'Angelo, L.L., Weinberger, D.A., & Feldman, S.S. (1995). Like father, like son? Predicting male adolescents' adjustment from parents' distress and self-restraint. Developmental Psychology, 31 (6), 883-896.
- Dienhart, A., & Daly, K. (1997). Men and women cocreating father involvement in a non-generative culture. In A.J. Hawkins and D.C. Dollahite (Eds.), Generative Fathering: Beyond Deficit Perspectives. (pp. 147-164). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

- Gall, M.D., Borg, W., & Gall, J.P. (1996). Educational research: An introduction, 6th edition. White Plains, New York: Longman Publishers.
- Ge, X., Conger, R.D., Lorenz, F.O., Shanahan, M., & Elder, H. (1995). Mutual influences in parent and adolescent psychological distress. Developmental Psychology, 31 (3), 406-419.
- Greene, A.L., & Grimsley, (1990). Age and gender differences in adolescent's preferences for parental advice: Mum's the word. Journal of Adolescent Research, 5 (4), 396-413.
- Griswold, R.L. (1997). Generative fathering: A historical perspective. In A.J. Hawkins and D.C. Dollahite (Eds.), Generative Fathering: Beyond Deficit Perspectives. (pp. 71-86). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Griswold, R.L. (1993). Fatherhood in America. New York: Basic Books.
- Gurian, M. (1996). The Wonder of Boys. New York: Putnam Books.
- Harris, K.M., Furstenberg, F.F., & Marmer, J.K. (1998). Paternal involvement with adolescents in intact families. The influence of fathers over the life course. Demography, 35 (2), 201-216.
- Harris, K.M., & Marmer, J.K. (1996). Poverty, paternal involvement and adolescent well-being. Journal of Family Issues, 17 (5), 614-640.
- Harris, K.M., & Morgan, S.P. (1991). Fathers, sons, and daughters: Differential paternal involvement in parenting. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 59, 531-544.

- Hawkins, A.J. & Dollahite, D.C. (1997). Generative fathering. Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage Publications.
- Hill, J.P., Holmbeck, G.N., Marlow, L., Green, T.M., & Lynch, M.E. (1985). Menarcheal status and parent-child relations in families of seventh grade girls. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 14 (4), 301-316.
- Hull, J.D. (1995, January). The State of the Union. Time, 53-75.
- Jain, A., Belsky, J., & Crnic, K. (1996). Beyond fathering behaviors: Types of dads. Journal of Family Psychology, 10 (4), 431-442.
- Jones, R.M., Akers, J.F., & White, J.M. (1994). Revised classification for the extended objective measure of ego identity status (eomeis). Journal of Adolescence, 17, 533-549.
- Jones, R.M. (1992). Ego identity and adolescent problem behavior. In G.R. Adams, T.P. Gullotta, & R. Montemayor (Eds.), Adolescent Indentity Formation, (pp. 216-233). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jones, R.M., Ross, C.N., & Hartmann, B.R. (1992). An investment of cognitive style and alcohol/work related problems among naval personnel. Journal of Drug Education, 22 (3), 241-251.
- Jones, R.M., & Streitmatter, J.L. (1987). Validity and reliability of the eom-eis for early adolescence. Adolescence, 22 (87), 647-659.



- Kawaguchi, M.C., Welsh, D.P., Powers, S.I., & Rostosky, S.S. (1998). Mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters: Temperament, gender, and adolescent-parent relationships. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 44 (1), 77-96.
- Kazdin, A.E. (1982). Single-Case Research Designs: Methods for Clinical and Applied Settings. New York: Oxford University Press.
- King, V. (1994). Nonresident father involvement and child well-being: Can dads make a difference? Journal of Family Issues, 15 (1), 78-96.
- Lamb, M.E. (1986). The changing roles of fathers. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), The Father's role: An applied perspective (pp. 3-27). New York: John Wiley.
- LaRossa, R., & Reitzes, D.C. (1993). Continuity and change in middle-class fatherhood, 1925-1939: The culture-conduct connection. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 55, 455-468.
- Latham, G.I. (1994). The Power of Positive Parenting: Salt Lake City, Ut: Northwest Publishing, Inc.
- Levine, J.A. (1993). Involving fathers in Head Start: A framework for public policy and program development. Families in Society, 74 (1), 4-21.
- Low, T. (1996). Fatherlessness: The central social problem of our time. Claremont Institute Home Page Editorial.

- Maccoby, E.E., & Martin, J.A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.) Handbook of Child Psychology, 4th Ed. Volume IV, Socialization, Personality, and Social Development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- MacDermid, S., & Crouter, A.C. (1995). Midlife, adolescence, and paternal employment in family systems. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 24 (1), 29-54.
- MacKey, W.C. (1998). Father presence: An enhancement of a child's well-being. Journal of Men's Studiess, 6 (2), 227-243.
- Marcia, J.E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 551-558.
- Margolin, L. (1992). Child Abuse by mother's boyfriends: Why the overrepresentation? Child Abuse and Neglect, 16 (4), 545-546.
- Marsiglio, W. (1993). Contemporary scholarship on fatherhood. Journal of Family Issues, 14 (4), 484-509.
- Marsiglio, W. (1991). Paternal engagement activities with minor children. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53, 973-986.
- Martin, D.H. (1985). Fathers and adolescents. In S.M.H. Hanson and F.W. Bozett (Eds.), Diminsions of fatherhood (pp. 170-195). Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications.
- McBride, B.A., & Rane, T.R. (1998). Parenting alliance as a predictor of father involvement: An exploratory study. Family Relations, 47, 229-236.

- McBride, B.A., & Mills, G. (1993). A comparison of mother and father involvement with their preschool age children. Early Child Research Quarter, 8, 457-477.
- Miller, B.C. (1986). Family research methods. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications.
- Newman, B. (1989). The changing nature of the parent-adolescent relationship from early to late adolescence. Adolescence, 24 (96), 915-936.
- Palkovitz, R. (1997). Expanding conceptualizations of men's caring. In A.J. Hawkins and D.C. Dollahite (Eds.), Generative Fathering: Beyond Deficit Perspectives. (pp. 200-216).
- Papini, D.R., & Sebbly, R.A. (1987). Adolescent pubertal status and affective family relationships: A multivariate assessment. Journal of Youth and Adolescence 16 (1), 1-15.
- Patterson, S.J., Sochting, I., & Marcia, J.E. (1992). The inner space and beyond: Women and identity. In G.R. Adams, T.P. Gulotta, & R. Montemayor (Eds.), Adolescent Identity Formation (pp. 9-24). Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage Publications.
- Paulson, S.E., & Sputa, C.L. (1996). Patterns of parenting during adolescence: Perceptions of adolescents and parents. Adolescence, 31 (122), 369-382.
- Peterson, A.C., Crockett, L., Richards, M., & Boxer, A. (1988). A self-report measure of pubertal status: Reliability, validity, and initial norms. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 17 (2), 117-133.
- Pittman, F. (1993). Fathers and sons: What it takes to be a man. Psychology Today, Sept/Oct, 52-54.

- Pleck, J.H. (1987). American fathering in historical perspective. In W.R. Scott & J.F. Short (Eds.), Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity (p. 86). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Popenoe, D. (1996). Life without Father. New York: Martin Kessler Books.
- Rice, F.P. (1999). The adolescent: Development, relationships, and culture. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Robinson, J.P., & Godbey, G. (1997). Time for life: The surprising way Americans use their time. University Park, Penn: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rossi, A.S. (1996, November). How Americans spend their time: Time allocation to job, family, home, and community. Paper presented as the Earnest W. Burgess Award Lecture to the 58th Annual Conference of the National Council on Family Relations, Kansas City, Missouri.
- Sagrestano, L.M., McCormick, S.H., Paikoff, R.L., & Holmbeck, G.N. (1999). Pubertal development and parent-child conflict in low-income, urban, African American adolescents. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 9 (1), 85-107.
- Shapiro, L. (1997, May). The myth of quality time. Newsweek. 62-68.
- Simmons, R.G., & Blyth, D.A. (1987). Moving into adolescence: The impact of pubertal change and school contexts. New York: Aldine de Gruytor.

- Sinkkonen, J., Anttila, R., & Siimes, M.A. (1998). Pubertal maturation and changes in self-image in early adolescent Finnish boys. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 27 (2), 209-218.
- Snarey, J. (1997). The next generation of work on fathering. In A.J. Hawkins and D.C. Dollahite (Eds.), Generative Fathering: Beyond Deficit Perspectives. (pp. ix-xii).
- Snarey, J. (1993). How Fathers Care for the Next Generation. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Steinberg, L. (1988). Reciprocal relation between parent-child distance and pubertal maturation. Developmental Psychology, 24, (1), 122-128.
- Steinberg, L. (1987). The impact of puberty on family relations: Effects of pubertal status and pubertal timing. Developmental Psychology, 23 (3), 451-460.
- Wahl, G., & Wertheim, L.J. (1998, May). Paternity ward. Sports Illustrated, 88 (18), 62-71.
- White, J.M., & Jones, R.M. (1996). Identity styles of male inmates. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 23 (3), 490-504.
- Whitehead, B.D. (1993). Dan Quayle was right. The Atlantic Monthly, 47-84.
- Woodworth, S. Belsky, J., & Crnic, K. (1996). The determinants of fathering during the child's second and third years of life: A developmental analysis. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58, 679-692.
- Yablonsky, L. (1990). Fathers and sons: The most challenging of all family relationships. New York: Gardner Press Trade Book Co.

Young, M.H., Miller, B.C., Norton, M.C., & Hill, E.J. (1995). The effect of parental supportive behaviors on life satisfaction of adolescent offspring. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57 (3), 813-822.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A. INFORMED CONSENT



**Informed Consent Form**  
**Father and Son Relationships**

- Purpose:** Randall M. Jones, Professor in the Family and Human Development department at Utah State University, is conducting a research study to find out more about father and adolescent-son relationships. You have been asked to participate in the study because you are a male between the ages of 11 and 18, and you have a father who lives in your home. There will be approximately 100 participants from your school district. If you choose to participate in this research project, you can be assured that your rights as a human subject must be protected. Before you agree, we want to be sure that you understand that your decision to take part, or not to take part, is entirely voluntary.
- Procedures:** If you agree to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete one survey. The survey will either be mailed to you, or given to you during class. The survey will take between 30 and 45 minutes to complete, and needs to be either mailed back, or turned into your teacher within 24 hours from the time you received it. Most of the questions on the survey are about your own attitudes, behavior, and circumstances pertaining to father and son relationships, and adolescence in general.
- Risks:** There are no known risks of the procedures outlined.
- Benefits:** There may or may not be any direct benefit to you from these procedures. The investigators, however, may learn more about father and son relationships. Furthermore, by completing the survey, some of the questions asked might stimulate you into thinking more about your relationship with your father, and how you feel about your self.
- Costs:** There will be no cost for you to participate in this research study.
- Explanation:** Mark Ogletree has explained this study to you and answered your questions. If you have any other research-related questions, you may reach Mark at 435-752-4265.
- Confidentiality:** Your responses will be kept in confidence, and no one other than the researcher will know how you answered the questions on the survey. The researcher is the only person who will have access to

the data you provide on the survey, and the surveys will be kept in a locked file cabinet in a locked room. After three months, the surveys will be shredded. Further, you will be assigned a code number; we will never know your name - only your code number.

**IRB Approval:** The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human subjects at Utah State University has reviewed and approved this research project.

**Consent Copy:** You have been given two copies of this Informed Consent. Please sign both copies and retain one copy for your files.

**Assurances:** I certify that the research study has been explained to the above individual, by me or my research staff, and that the individual understands the nature and purpose, the possible risks and benefits associated with taking part in this research study. Any questions that have been raised, have been answered.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Randall M. Jones, Project Director  
435-797-1553

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark D. Ogletree, Student Researcher  
435-752-4265, ext. 147

**Consent:** I have read about the study of fathers and sons as described above. By signing this consent form I agree to participate by completing the survey. Furthermore, I also give my consent that my son may participate in this study.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Parent's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Youth Assent:** I understand that my mother/father/parent(s) is/are aware of this research study and that permission has been given for me to participate. I understand that it is up to me to participate even if my parents say "yes." If I do not want to be in this study I do not have to and no one will be upset if I don't want to participate or if I change my mind later and want to stop. I can ask any questions that I have about this study now or later. By signing below I agree to participate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Youth's signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## APPENDIX B: SONS' VERSION OF THE SURVEY

**This questionnaire will take about 45 minutes.** We at Utah State University are grateful for your willingness to participate in this father and sons survey. We ask that you do your best in completing this form. When you are finished, hand the survey in to your teacher or coach.

Begin by putting your ID number on the top of the form. These numbers will be used for research purposes only. Be assured that the information you provide below **will not be shared with anyone!** Your responses are strictly confidential!

Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge. Write your answer in the space provided next to the question or circle the appropriate response. If you can't remember specifics, please give your best estimate.

1. Date of Birth (\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_) (Month) (Day) (Year)
2. What grade are you currently in? 6th 7th 8th 9th 10th 11th 12th
3. Choose the response that best describes your current family structure (the family you live in):
  1. Intact (you live with both of your biological parents)
  2. Step (Biological father and step-mother)
  3. Step (Biological mother and step-father)
  4. Single-parent (Single father raising the children alone)
  5. Single-parent (Single mother raising the children alone)
  6. Cohabiting (Biological mother living with boyfriend)
  7. Cohabiting (Biological father living with girlfriend)
  8. Other (live with Grandparents, relatives, friends)
4. How many people are there in your immediate family? (Count both parents and children) \_\_\_\_\_
5. About how often do you attend religious services or activities?
  1. Never
  2. Less than once a month
  3. Once or twice a month
  4. Once a week
  5. More than once a week
6. What is your religion?
  1. Catholic
  2. Jewish
  3. Mormon (LDS)
  4. Protestant
  5. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  6. No religion
7. How much time do you spend with your father during a typical day? (in hours) \_\_\_\_\_
8. How much time do you spend with your father during a typical week? (in hours) \_\_\_\_\_

The following statements relate to your own physical development. Please circle one of the following responses for each statement.

		No Development (1)	Development has barely begun (2)	Development is definitely underway (3)	Development is already completed (4)
9.	Body Hair	1	2	3	4
10.	Voice Change	1	2	3	4
11.	Skin Change	1	2	3	4
12.	Growth Spurt	1	2	3	4
13.	Facial Hair	1	2	3	4

In answering items 14-27, please circle the appropriate answer using the following responses:

		Never (1)	Hardly Ever (2)	Sometimes (3)	Fairly Often (4)	Very Often (5)
14.	Whenever I have any kind of problem, I can count on my father to help me out.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	My father feels affection for me and I am certain of it.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	My father teaches me things I want to learn.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	My father makes me feel he is there if I need him.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	My father shows positive interest in and support of me in my daily affairs.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I feel secure in my relationship with my father.	1	2	3	4	5

		Never (1)	Hardly Ever (2)	Sometimes (3)	Fairly Often (4)	Very Often (5)
20.	My father kisses me goodnight.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	My father kisses me goodbye.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	My father kisses me on other occasions.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	My father hugs or embraces me.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	My father lets me sit on his lap.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	My father picks me up for safety reasons.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	My father picks me up for fun.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	I am satisfied with my relationship with my father.	1	2	3	4	5

In answering questions 28-34, please circle the appropriate answer using the following response choices.

		Not like him (1)	Somewhat like him (2)	Very much like him (3)
28.	My father spends time with me	1	2	3
29.	My father enjoys doing things with me.	1	2	3
30.	My father shares many activities with me.	1	2	3
31.	My father talks with me often.	1	2	3
32.	My father likes to talk to me and be with me much of the time.	1	2	3
33.	My father hugs and kisses me often.	1	2	3
34.	My father hugs and kisses me good night.	1	2	3

Each of the following statements reflect personal feelings held by some in this society. We are interested in how much you agree with each statement. Because these statements reflect personal feelings and attitudes, there are no right and wrong answers. The BEST response to each of the following statements is your PERSONAL OPINION. We have tried to cover many points of view. You may find yourself agreeing with some statements and disagreeing with others. Regardless of how you feel, you can be sure that many others feel the same as you do.

RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT ACCORDING TO YOUR OPINION BY CIRCLING THE ANSWER THAT BEST REFLECTS YOUR OPINION.

		Strongly disagree (1)	Moderately disagree (2)	Disagree somewhat (3)	Agree somewhat (4)	Moderately agree (5)	Strongly agree (6)
35.	My parents know what's best for me in terms of how to choose friends.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36.	In finding an acceptable viewpoint to life itself, I often exchange ideas with friends and family.	1	2	3	4	5	6
37.	All my recreational preferences were taught to me by my parents and I haven't really felt a need to look for.	1	2	3	4	5	6
38.	I have lots of different ideas about how a marriage might work, and now I'm trying to arrive at some comfortable position.	1	2	3	4	5	6
39.	I know what my parents feel about men's and women's roles, but I pick and choose what my own lifestyle will be.	1	2	3	4	5	6
40.	After a lot of self-examination, I have established a very definite view of what my own lifestyle will be.	1	2	3	4	5	6
41.	My own views on a desirable lifestyle were taught to me by my parents and I don't see any reason to question what they taught me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
42.	I really have never been involved in politics enough to have made a stand one way or another.	1	2	3	4	5	6





		Strongly disagree (1)	Moderately disagree (2)	Disagree somewhat (3)	Agree somewhat (4)	Moderately agree (5)	Strongly agree (6)
		↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
53.	I'm really not interested in finding the right job, any job will do. I just seem to go with what is available.	1	2	3	4	5	6
54.	While I don't have one recreational activity I'm really committed to, I'm experiencing numerous activities to identify one I can truly enjoy.	1	2	3	4	5	6
55.	I'm not completely sure about my political beliefs, but I'm trying to figure out what I truly believe in.	1	2	3	4	5	6
56.	I've thought my political beliefs through and realize that I can agree with some and not other aspects of my parent's beliefs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
57.	I know my parents don't approve of some of my friends, but I haven't decided what to do about that yet.	1	2	3	4	5	6
58.	I'm not sure what religion means to me. I'd like to make up my mind, but I'm not done looking yet.	1	2	3	4	5	6
59.	I've come through a period of serious questions about faith and now can say that I understand what I believe as an individual.	1	2	3	4	5	6
60.	Some of my friends are very different from each other. I'm trying to figure out exactly where I fit in.	1	2	3	4	5	6
61.	When it comes to religion, I haven't found anything that appeals to me and I really don't feel the need to look.	1	2	3	4	5	6
62.	I've tried numerous recreational activities and have found one I really love to do by myself or with friends.	1	2	3	4	5	6

		<div>Strongly disagree (1)</div> <div>Moderately disagree (2)</div> <div>Disagree somewhat (3)</div> <div>Agree somewhat (4)</div> <div>Moderately agree (5)</div> <div>Strongly agree (6)</div>					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
63.	I couldn't be friends with someone my parent's disapprove of.	1	2	3	4	5	6
64.	My parents recreational activities are enough for me - I'm content with the same activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
65.	My parent's views on life are good enough for me, I don't need anything else.	1	2	3	4	5	6
66.	I don't give religion much thought and it doesn't bother me one way or the other.	1	2	3	4	5	6
67.	I've been experiencing a variety of recreational activities in hopes of finding one or more I can enjoy for sometime to come.	1	2	3	4	5	6
68.	My dating standards are flexible, but in order to change, it must be something I really believe in.	1	2	3	4	5	6
69.	I've had many different kinds of friends, but now I have a clear idea of what I look for in a friendship.	1	2	3	4	5	6
70.	I don't have any close friends - I just like to hang around with the crowd and have a good time.	1	2	3	4	5	6
71.	A person's faith is unique to each individual. I've considered it myself and know what I believe.	1	2	3	4	5	6
72.	I've never really questioned my religion. If it's right for my parents it must be right for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6

		Strongly disagree (1)	Moderately disagree (2)	Disagree somewhat (3)	Agree somewhat (4)	Moderately agree (5)	Strongly agree (6)
		↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
73.	There are many ways that married couples can divide up family responsibilities. I've thought about lots of ways, and know how I want it to happen for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
74.	My ideas about men's and women's roles are quite similar to those of my parents. What's good enough for them is good enough for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
75.	I would never date anyone my parents disapprove of.	1	2	3	4	5	6
76.	I've never had any real close friends - it would take too much energy to keep a friendship going.	1	2	3	4	5	6
77.	Sometimes I wonder if the way other people date is the best way for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
78.	I haven't really considered politics. It just doesn't excite me much.	1	2	3	4	5	6
79.	After considerable thought, I've developed my own individual viewpoint of what is an ideal "lifestyle" and don't believe anyone will be likely to change my perspective.	1	2	3	4	5	6
80.	I haven't chosen the occupation I really want to get into, and I'm just working at whatever is available until something better comes along.	1	2	3	4	5	6
81.	The standards or "unwritten rules" I follow about dating are still in the process of developing - they haven't completely gelled yet.	1	2	3	4	5	6

		Strongly disagree (1)	Moderately disagree (2)	Disagree somewhat (3)	Agree somewhat (4)	Moderately agree (5)	Strongly agree (6)
		↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
82.	My folks have always had their own political and moral beliefs about issues like and mercy killing and I've always gone along accepting what they have.	1	2	3	4	5	6
83.	My rules or standards about dating have remained the same since I first started going out and I don't anticipate that they will change.	1	2	3	4	5	6
84.	I'm not ready to start thinking about how married couples should divide up family responsibilities yet.	1	2	3	4	5	6
85.	There's no single "lifestyle" which appeals to me more than another.	1	2	3	4	5	6
86.	It took me a while to figure it out, but now I really know what I want for a career.	1	2	3	4	5	6
87.	I'm still trying to decide how capable I am as a person and what jobs will be right for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
88.	Politics is something that I can never be too sure about because things change so fast. But I do think it is important to know what I politically stand for and believe in.	1	2	3	4	5	6
89.	I might have thought about a lot of different jobs but there's never really been any questions since my parents said what they wanted.	1	2	3	4	5	6
90.	I have one recreational activity I love to engage in more than any other and doubt I'll find another that I enjoy more.	1	2	3	4	5	6
91.	My ideas about men's and women's roles have been taught to me by my family.	1	2	3	4	5	6

		Strongly disagree (1)					Moderately disagree (2)		Disagree somewhat (3)		Agree somewhat (4)		Moderately agree (5)		Strongly agree (6)	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3
92.	I'm looking for an acceptable perspective for my own "lifestyle" view, but I haven't really found it yet.	1	2	3	4	5	6									
93.	I seem only to get involved in recreational activities when others ask me to join them.	1	2	3	4	5	6									
94.	I attend the same church my family has always attended. I've never questioned why.	1	2	3	4	5	6									
95.	I took me a long time to decide, but now I know for sure what direction to move in for a career.	1	2	3	4	5	6									
96.	I join my friends in leisure activities, but I really don't seem to have a particular activity I pursue systematically.	1	2	3	4	5	6									
97.	I've dated different types of people and now know exactly what my own "unwritten rules" for dating are.	1	2	3	4	5	6									
98.	There are so many political parties and ideals. I can't decide which to follow until I figure it all out.	1	2	3	4	5	6									

**Thank you for your help!**

## APPENDIX C. FATHERS' VERSION OF THE SURVEY

**Fathers and Son's Survey****Father's Version**

ID Number \_\_\_\_\_

**This questionnaire will take about 45 minutes.** We at Utah State University are grateful for your willingness to participate in this father and sons survey. We ask that you do your best in completing this form. When you are finished, give the survey back to your son to turn into his teacher immediately. This must be turned in within the next 5 days.

Begin by putting your ID number on the top of the form. Make sure your ID number matches your sons. These numbers will be used for research purposes only. Be assured that the information you provide below **will not be shared with anyone!** Your responses are strictly confidential!

Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge. Write your answer in the space provided next to the question or circle the appropriate response. If you can't remember specifics, please give your best estimate.

1. Date of Birth (\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_)
   
 (Month) (Day) (Year)
2. What was your approximate income last year? (circle one)
   
 \$0-20,000    \$20-40,000    \$40-60,000
   
 \$60-80,000    \$80-100,000    \$100,000 +
3. How many years of schooling have you completed \_\_\_\_\_
4. Choose the response that best describes your current family structure (the family you are the father of):
  1. Intact (both biological parents)
  2. Step (Biological father and step-mother)
  3. Step (Biological mother and step-father)
  4. Single (Single father raising the children alone)
  5. Single (Single mother raising the children alone)
  6. Cohabiting (Biological mother living with boyfriend)
  7. Cohabiting (Biological father living with girlfriend)
  8. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
5. How many people in your immediate family? (Count both parents and children) \_\_\_\_\_
   
 Number of sons \_\_\_\_\_; Number of daughters \_\_\_\_\_
6. About how often do you attend religious services or activities?
  1. Never
  2. Less than once a month
  3. Once or twice a month
  4. Once a week
  5. More than once a week
7. If applicable, what is your religious affiliation? \_\_\_\_\_ (name of your church or denomination)
8. How much time do you spend with your son during a typical day? (in hours) \_\_\_\_\_
9. How much time do you spend with your son during a typical week? (in hours) \_\_\_\_\_

The following statements relate to your son's physical development. As best as you can, please circle one of the following responses for each statement.

		No Development (1)	Development has barely begun (2)	Development is definitely underway (3)	Development is already completed (4)
10.	Body Hair	1	2	3	4
11.	Voice Change	1	2	3	4
12.	Skin Change	1	2	3	4
13.	Growth Spurt	1	2	3	4
14.	Facial Hair	1	2	3	4

In answering items 15-27, please circle the appropriate answer using the following responses:

		Never (1)	Hardly Ever (2)	Sometimes (3)	Fairly Often (4)	Very Often (5)
15.	Whenever my son has any kind of problem, he can count on me to help him out.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	I feel affection for my son and he is certain of it.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	I teach my son things he wants to learn.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	My son knows I will be there if he needs me.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I show positive interest in and support for my son in his daily affairs.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	My son feels secure in his relationship with me.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I kiss my son goodnight.	1	2	3	4	5



		Never (1)	Hardly Ever (2)	Sometimes (3)	Fairly Often (4)	Very Often (5)
		↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
22.	I kiss my son goodbye.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	I kiss my son on other occasions.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	I hug or embrace my son.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	I let my son sit on my lap.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	I pick-up my son up for safety reasons.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	I pick-up my son up for fun.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	I am satisfied with my relationship with my son.	1	2	3	4	5

In answering questions 29-35, please circle the appropriate answer using the following response choices.

		Not like me (1)	Somewhat like me (2)	Very much like me (3)
		↓	↓	↓
29.	I spend time with my son.	1	2	3
30.	I enjoy doing things with my son.	1	2	3
31.	I share many activities with my son.	1	2	3
32.	I talk with my son often.	1	2	3
33.	I like to talk to my son and be with him much of the time.	1	2	3
34.	I hug and kiss my son often.	1	2	3
35.	I hug and kiss my son good night.	1	2	3

The following statements require your opinion as to whether they are like you or not. Please select a number between 1 and 5 that best reflects how much you feel that statement is like you or not like you. Your first reaction to each question should be your answer.

		Very much like me (1)	Somewhat like me (2)	Not sure (3)	Somewhat unlike me (4)	Very much unlike me (5)
36.	Regarding religious beliefs, I know basically what I believe and don't believe.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	I've spent a great deal of time thinking seriously about what I should do with my life.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	I'm not really sure what I'm doing in school; I guess things will work themselves out.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	I've more-or-less always operated according to the values with which I was brought up.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	I've spent a good deal of time reading and talking to others about religious ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	When I discuss an issue with someone, I try to assume their point of view and see the problem from their perspective.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	I know what I want to do with my future.	1	2	3	4	5
43.	It doesn't pay to worry about values in advance; I decided things as they happen.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	I'm not really sure what I believe about religion.	1	2	3	4	5
45.	I've always had purpose in my life; I was brought up to know what to strive for.	1	2	3	4	5
46.	I'm not sure which values I really hold.	1	2	3	4	5
47.	I have some consistent political views; I have a definite stand on where the government and country should be headed.	1	2	3	4	5
48.	Many times by not concerning myself with personal problems, they work themselves out.	1	2	3	4	5

		Very much like me (1)	Somewhat like me (2)	Not sure (3)	Somewhat <u>un</u> like me (4)	Very much <u>un</u> like me (5)
49.	I'm not sure what I want to do in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
50.	I'm really into my major; it's the academic area that is right for me.	1	2	3	4	5
51.	I've spent a lot of time reading and trying to make sense of political issues.	1	2	3	4	5
52.	I'm not really thinking about my future right now; it's still a long way off.	1	2	3	4	5
53.	I've spent a lot of time and talked to a lot of people trying to develop a set of values that make sense to me.	1	2	3	4	5
54.	Regarding religion, I've always known what I believe and don't believe; I never really had any serious doubts.	1	2	3	4	5
55.	I'm not sure what I should major in (or change to).	1	2	3	4	5
56.	I've known since high school that I was going to college and what I was going to major in.	1	2	3	4	5
57.	I have a definite set of values that I use in order to make personal decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
58.	I think it's better to have a firm set of beliefs than to be open minded.	1	2	3	4	5
59.	When I make a decision, I try to wait as long as possible in order to see what will happen.	1	2	3	4	5
60.	When I have a personal problem, I try to analyze the situation in order to understand it.	1	2	3	4	5
61.	I find it best to seek out advice from professionals (e.g. Clergy, doctors, lawyers) when I have problems.	1	2	3	4	5

		Very much like me (1)	Somewhat like me (2)	Not sure (3)	Somewhat unlike me (4)	Very much unlike me (5)
62.	It's best for me not to take life too seriously; I just try to enjoy it.	1	2	3	4	5
63.	I think it's better to have a fixed set of values, than to consider alternative values systems.	1	2	3	4	5
64.	I try not to think about or deal with problems as long as I can.	1	2	3	4	5
65.	I find that personal problems often turn out to be interesting challenges.	1	2	3	4	5
66.	I try to avoid personal situations that will require me to think a lot and deal with them on my own.	1	2	3	4	5
67.	Once I know the correct way to handle a problem, I prefer to stick with it.	1	2	3	4	5
68.	When I have to make a decision, I like to spend a lot of time thinking about my options.	1	2	3	4	5
69.	I prefer to deal with situations where I can rely on social norms and standards.	1	2	3	4	5
70.	I like to have the responsibility for handling problems in my life that require me to think on my own.	1	2	3	4	5
71.	Sometimes I refuse to believe that a problem will happen, and things manage to work themselves out.	1	2	3	4	5
72.	When making important decisions I like to have as much information as possible.	1	2	3	4	5
73.	When I know a situation is going to cause me stress, I try to avoid it.	1	2	3	4	5
74.	To live a complete life, I think people need to get emotionally involved and commit themselves to specific values and ideals.	1	2	3	4	5
75.	I find it's best to rely on the advice of close friends or relatives when I have a problem.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D. SOURCE TABLE FOR PSYCHOSOCIAL STATUS BY SONS'  
ESTIMATE OF PUBERTY

Pubertal Status by Mean Score for Achievement

Source (A)	df	MS	F
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	109.96	.62
Within Groups (Error)	156	177.52	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

-----

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Diffusion

Source (D)	df	MS	F
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	222.73	1.44
Within Groups (Error)	157	154.77	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

-----

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Foreclosure

Source (F)	df	MS	F
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	1112.46	6.45**
Within Groups (Error)	155	172.36	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

-----

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Moratorium

Source (M)	df	MS	F
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	148.21	.84
Within Groups (Error)	156	175.58	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

APPENDIX E. SOURCE TABLE FOR PSYCHOSOCIAL STATUS BY FATHERS'  
ESTIMATE OF PUBERTY

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Achievement

Source (A)	df	MS	F
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	88.55	.57
Within Groups (Error)	110	155.55	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

-----

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Diffusion

Source (D)	df	MS	F
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	301.68	2.49
Within Groups (Error)	111	121.33	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

-----

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Foreclosure

Source (F)	df	MS	F
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	1641.77	12.90**
Within Groups (Error)	109	127.26	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

-----

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Moratorium

Source (M)	df	MS	F
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	47.61	.30
Within Groups (Error)	110	159.40	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .



APPENDIX F. SOURCE TABLE FOR PUBERTAL STATUS BY MEAN SCORES  
FOR FATHER INVOLVEMENT (FATHERS' RATING)

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Sustained Contact

Source (SC)	df	MS	F
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	7.13	.40
Within Groups (Error)	111	17.74	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

-----

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Physical Affection

Source (PA)	df	MS	F
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	52.02	1.41
Within Groups (Error)	111	36.89	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

-----

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for General Support

Source (GA)	df	MS	F
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	32.98	2.28
Within Groups (Error)	111	14.47	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

-----

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Companionship

Source (C)	df	MS	F
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	6.53	.49
Within Groups (Error)	111	13.43	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

APPENDIX G. SOURCE TABLE FOR PUBERTAL STATUS BY MEAN SCORES  
FOR FATHER INVOLVEMENT (SONS' RATING)

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Sustained Contact

Source (SC)	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	28.87	3.69*
Within Groups (Error)	157	7.82	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Physical Affection

Source (PA)	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	214.76	7.96**
Within Groups (Error)	157	26.99	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for General Support

Source (GA)	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	173.79	4.61*
Within Groups (Error)	157	37.68	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Pubertal Status by Mean Scores for Companionship

Source (C)	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups (Puberty)	2	39.08	5.4**
Within Groups (Error)	157	7.23	

Note. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

## APPENDIX H. VITA

## Vita

**Mark Dryden Ogletree**

**Office Address:**

Logan LDS Institute of Religion  
600 Darwin Avenue  
Logan, Utah 84321  
(435) 752-4265, ext. 147

**Home Address:**

144 E. 100 North  
Hyde Park, Utah 84318  
(435) 563-1983

**Date of Birth:**

17 November 1962

**Place of Birth:**

Shreveport, Caddo Parish,  
Louisiana

**Marital Status:**

Married Janie Cook, 19 April 1985  
Children: 7

Brittany, 12	Madison, 8
Brandon, 11	Cassidy, 4
Bethany, 9	Callie, 1
McKenzie, 8	

**Education:**

Ph.D. Candidate, Utah State University, Logan, Utah. Family and Human Development,  
Expected Graduation - May 2000.

Master of Arts in Mental Health Counseling, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff,  
Arizona. May 1994.

Master of Arts in Education, Human Relations, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff,  
Arizona. August 1990.

Bachelor of Arts, Human Resource Development, Brigham Young University, Provo,  
Utah. August 1987.

**Fields of Knowledge:**

Organizational Behavior  
Human Resources  
Human Relations  
Adult Education  
Training and Development

Mental Health Counseling  
 Marriage and Family Therapy  
 Family and Human Development  
 Marriage and Family Relations

**Professional Affiliations:**

National Council of Family Relations  
 Utah Council of Family Relations  
 American Counseling Association

**Honors:**

National Dean's List, Master of Counseling, Northern Arizona  
 University, 1994

Deans List, Stephen F. Austin State University

Top Three Finisher, 500 Page Training system, BYU Organizational  
 Behavior Department.

**Employment History:**

- 1999 - Coordinator and Institute Director, Church Education System, Dallas, Texas. Responsible for religious instruction among University Students at University of Texas at Dallas, Texas A&M University in Commerce, Texas, Tyler Jr. College, Tyler, Texas, and Collin County Community College, Plano, Texas.
- 1991 - Continuing Education Presenter, Brigham Young University, United States and Canada.
- 1996-1999 Instructor, Logan Institute of Religion, Logan, Utah. Class instruction of religious doctrine and marriage and family preparation.
- 1996-1999 Part time counselor, LDS Social Services, Logan, Utah. Treatment of depression, marriage counseling, parenting issues.
- 1996-1999 Student instructor, Utah State University, Logan, Utah. Taught Family and Human Development 120 "Marriage and the American Family," once each year for the department.
- 1994-1996 Principal, Dobson LDS Seminary, Mesa, Arizona.
- 1994-1995 Assessment Clinician, Desert Vista Mental Health Hospital, Mesa, Arizona.
- 1991-1996 Mental Health Practitioner, East Valley Counseling Center, Mesa, Arizona.

1987-1996 Instructor, Mountain View LDS Seminary, Mesa, Arizona.

**Conference Presentations:**

- 1997 **Poster.** Conference for Utah Council on Family Relations: "Using family strengths as intervention in Therapy," Provo, Utah.
- 1998 **Poster.** Conference for Utah Council on Family Relations: "Father Presence: A Biosocial Model," Ogden, Utah.
- 1998 **Paper.** Conference for Utah Council on Family Relations: "The effects of economic distress on fathers," Ogden, Utah.

**Manuscripts in progress:**

Ogletree, M.D. Jones, R.M., & Coyl, D. (dissertation manuscript in progress). Father involvement and son pubertal status.

**References:**

Randall M. Jones, Ph.D., Department of Family and Human Development, Utah State University, Logan, Utah 84322  
(435-797-1553).

S. Brent Farley, Ph.D., Institute Director, Logan Institute of Religion, Logan, Utah 84321  
(435-752-4265).

Oliver McPhearson, M.S.W., Agency Director, LDS Social Services, Logan Agency, Logan, Utah, 84321.  
(435-752-5302)